

*To be senior assistant scientist*

Edward J. Cone Cecil H. Fox  
Robert B. Dick Gary C. Schatz  
Derek E. Dunn

*To be sanitarian*

Kenneth E. Bailey  
Eduardo G. Campos

*To be senior assistant sanitarian*

Gordon Denipah, Jr. Eladio Perez-Zayas  
Jerry W. Newman Russell J. Vizina  
David H. Pedersen

*To be veterinary officer*

Samuel R. Adams, Jr.

*To be pharmacist*

Donald D. Morgan

*To be senior assistant pharmacist*

Thomas J. Ambrose  
David A. Apgar  
James W. Bredon  
Homer R. Burton  
Dennis C. Dahl  
Norman M. Harrington  
Arthur J. Lawrence, Jr.  
Melvin Lessing  
Delbert G. Martin  
Karl O. Nease  
Robbin M. Nighswander  
James E. Riley, Jr.  
Thomas G. Rotella

*To be assistant pharmacist*

Franklin D. Stottlemeyer  
Frankie L. Sutton  
Kenneth R. Turner  
Michael W. Woodford

*To be assistant dietitian*

Michael F. Breckinridge  
Paul A. Bucci, Jr.  
William T. Giddens  
Alfredo Matella, Jr.  
Merrill J. Mille  
David J. Morgan  
Roger D. Nicolaus  
Robert W. Parrish  
Donald C. Peters  
Kenneth L. Spear  
Gary E. Work  
Tommy L. Worth

*To be assistant dietitian*

Alice A. Jones  
Janice M. Rary  
Cathy A. Tonjes

*To be senior assistant therapist*

Roger R. Berry James H. Laursen  
William A. Fromherz Margaret A. Wilson  
Jimmy R. Jones

*To be assistant therapist*

James A. Akers Andrew L. Smith  
James M. Bittinger Richard D. Tarman  
Ailda R. Haskins Peter J. Whalen  
Joseph M. McCulloch Alfred F. C. Wong

*To be health services officer*

Loretta A. Coughlin Walter K. Hunter  
James E. Hamilton Edmond Steele, Jr.

*To be senior assistant health services officer*

William S. Collins David B. Maglott  
Joseph M. Cummins Timothy J. Nolan  
Lila R. Davis Thomas M. Osborn  
Paul B. Eckel Fred M. Randall  
Michael Fuchs Stephen W. Smith  
Bruce A. Herman Edwin S. Spier  
James W. Langford Stuart M. Swayze  
Solomon Levy Theodore J. Weinberg

*To be assistant health services officer*

Donald J. Benchoff Emmett E. Noll  
Elmon S. Crumpler Melvin E. Segal  
James M. Harmon Donald R. Tillery  
Alejandro R. Montanay

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 18, 1975:

## COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Burton Gordon Malkiel, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

(The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## CBS RIFT COMES OUT IN THE OPEN

## HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1975

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, lest the press believe we are not as interested in their parochial concerns as they are in ours, I offer the following Washington Star report, that historians might note it:

[From the Washington Star, July 14, 1975]

CBS RIFT COMES OUT IN THE OPEN—COLLEAGUES MIFFED AT SCHORR'S SLIP

(By Judy Flander)

A dispute between CBS correspondent Daniel Schorr and some of his network colleagues over what happened the day President Nixon resigned has erupted into the public's view, despite attempts to keep it quiet.

In a letter in the current issue of New York Magazine, Eric Sevareid, Walter Cronkite and Dan Rather protest statements published in an earlier issue of the magazine describing Schorr as "the man who made TV executives all over the nation wince when he admitted in a comment at Duke University, that the TV networks were ready to take it easy on Richard Nixon on the night he resigned. . . . As a result of that public admission, CBS News reporters were barred by the network from talking about each other in public."

"It's ridiculous," Sevareid said the other day. "No president ever gave us so much trouble. Why would they issue orders to go easy just because he (Nixon) was a beaten man. It just doesn't happen that way."

Sevareid, who initiated the letter after nearly a year of silence, "is mad as hell," said Dan Rather, who is pretty sore himself: "What you've got here is that the rest of us were ready to whore for the company. I did not roll over for anybody."

Cronkite, on vacation, could not be reached for comment; CBS newsman Roger

Mudd, who did not sign the letter, refused to talk about "an internal" matter. When asked if this was because of orders from above, Mudd laughed and said, "Certainly not."

Since the comments at Duke and an interview Aug. 19 in the Denver Post, Schorr himself has maintained a stubborn silence, despite repeated pleas from Rather to clarify the matter and at least two published interview-profiles, the one in New York Magazine, written by William Barry Furlong, and another in Village Voice, by Ann Pincus, which rehearsed the Duke thesis, much to the consternation of Schorr's colleagues who were becoming increasingly irate.

The New York Magazine piece was the final straw for Sevareid: "The letter was written for two reasons," he said. "Mr. Schorr has made no public message to undo the damage to us by whatever he said in his remarks at Duke University and, second, no reporter has ever checked with me. It just sits there, being repeated; soon it will be in books and in college textbooks as part of the myth of TV."

"I felt I had to protest however painful and intramural it is. I have been in this business 36 years and I'm going to retire in a couple of years and I'm not going out with a smudge on my face."

The first time Rather confronted Schorr about the Duke comments, Schorr "said flatly he hadn't said this." Shortly after, CBS got hold of a tape of Schorr's Duke University remarks. Rather relates: "I called Dan again and he said he simply couldn't believe he said what he did. I misspoke myself. I don't know why. I have no evidence to support that whatever," he told me."

Schorr is still adamant about not discussing the matter with reporters, although he angrily brands as "inaccurate, an invention," the statement in New York Magazine about CBS correspondents being barred from talking about each other in public. But the whole situation is "painful" to him, was about all he would say the other day. "I committed an indiscretion and I'm not going to perpetuate an indiscretion by putting it on the pages of magazines and newspapers," he said, explaining why he is letting the record stand. "If I clarified this, I would partly dispel dis-

tortions and partly reenforce others. I cannot clarify it without perpetuating it. I want the whole thing to die."

The episode apparently began when Schorr was excluded from the post-Nixon-resignation speech analysis in which Sevareid, Rather, Cronkite and Roger Mudd participated. "Dan expected and wanted to be part of it," Rather said. "I know Dan was angry about it. I agreed with him. But somebody has to make decisions; they had something else they wanted him to do—he was on the air a good deal that night."

Adding to Schorr's pique was another decision that affected him: 2½ hours of "bank" material—taped segments to be used only if needed, according to William Small, CBS senior vice president and director of news—was never used. Included was a "political obituary" narrated by Schorr. "We decided it was better to stay live," explained Small. "In retrospect, we were right; it was much better to be live, we did a better job than the other networks."

Schorr had another interpretation: In his Denver Post interview, he was quoted as saying, "I was a necessary piece of CBS' ammunition that turned out to be expendable. They didn't want curtain calls. 'We must not look vindictive,' they said. 'We must stress the healing process—Ford and the future.'"

In the same article, in which he said it was "professionally unethical" to talk about his colleagues, Schorr noted, in an apparent reference to Rather, "It is self-indulgent for a man in TV news to let himself show emotions, or to say, 'Tonight is supposed to be a night of reconciliation so I will restrain myself from the most objective analysis I can give.'"

Small said that he thought Schorr might have been reacting to the comments most of the correspondents made about Nixon's speech. "They thought it had 'class' and I agree with them." Rather explained his own remarks about Nixon: "I may have made a mistake that night—and I do not consider it a mistake—but if so the mistake was mine. I deeply resent the accusation we were told, 'Look, cool it on Nixon.' If anyone told me that I probably would have knocked him on his ass."

The "Duke comments" kept coming back to haunt them all. The matter might have been dropped. Rather said, if it hadn't been for the "puff piece in Village Voice. It was gutsy Dan Schorr who stuck his neck out rather than cool it. The story was bullshit, obviously; there were no direct quotes." Both Rather and Severeid said that they had never been contacted by reporters about the story before. "It's picked up and reused, usually by young liberal left writers who do not want the image spoiled by the fact," said Severeid.

When Severeid proposed the New York magazine protest letter, Rather went to Schorr and "begged" him to write a letter instead. "I told him, 'This has reached a ridiculous stage. You made a mistake, all you have to do is come out and say you misspoke.' Dan said, 'I can't talk about it.'"

Schorr's colleagues seem more disturbed than Small and Richard Salant, president of CBS news, both of whom reacted with laughter when quoted chapter and verse about their alleged orders to soft-pedal on Nixon and to desist from talking about one another in public.

"It must be true, look at the letter in New York magazine," laughed Small. "I knew the letter was being written. The implication that somebody sends down orders is something to protest. All Schorr's colleagues were upset; it (a ruling from above) could hardly have happened without their knowing about it. Dan isn't even an anchorman."

Salant was amused by Schorr's comment about the subject being too painful to discuss: "Sure it's painful for him; if you stick your foot in your mouth."

As for Schorr, he said that maybe someday he'd talk about it—"when I'm not on the payroll of the persons I'm talking about."

#### ANNUAL CONVENTION OF BULGARIAN EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH HELD IN NEW YORK

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to note last week's annual convention of the Bulgarian Eastern Orthodox Church Dioceses of New York and Akron. As in the past, this convention provides current members of the church with an opportunity to review past history and chart their agendas for the future.

As we prepare to celebrate the annual Captive Nations Week observance, I feel it fitting that I insert into the RECORD a brief history of the church which was sent to me by Dr. Kalin Koicheff, convention chairman. I urge my colleagues to read this material and reaffirm our support for the people of Bulgaria and the 28 other Captive Nations whose basic freedoms including freedom of religion is denied. We must work to help them regain basic freedoms and human dignity for their continued oppression flies in the face of any realistic efforts we can hope to make with the Soviet Union for détente. Without them relaxing their stranglehold on their satellite nations, any agreements between our two nations will be worthless.

The brief history follows:

BULGARIAN EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH

We are proud to be spiritual children of the Bulgarian Church, the oldest Orthodox Church in the Balkan Peninsula.

Shortly after the conversion of our people (865 A.D.) the Council of Constantinople of 870 A.D. granted autocephalous status to the Bulgarian Orthodox Church. During the reign of King Simeon the Great, in 917 it was elevated to the status of Patriarchate.

The leaders of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church at that time, St. Clement of Ochrida, St. Naum of Preslav, Chernorizets Khrabr, John the Exarch, to mention a few, made an enormous contribution towards the making of what is known as the Golden Age of Bulgarian literature.

At the end of the 14th century, in the times of Patriarch Evtimiy of Tirmovo, a great ecclesiastical and national leader, Bulgaria fell under Turkish rule and the Patriarchate was abolished. There followed five hundred years of a dark, unbearable and disastrous yoke.

In 1762 a modest Bulgarian monk from Khilendar Monastery, Mount Athos, Paisy signaled the beginnings of the Bulgarian national and spiritual Renaissance with his Slavic-Bulgarian History. The movement started by Paisy culminated in the creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate of Constantinople in 1870. Let by two astute and patriotic personalities, the Exarchs Antim and Joseph, it fought for the political, cultural and spiritual independence of its people in Bulgaria and Macedonia.

The crowning event of this struggle was the liberation of Bulgaria in 1878 as the result of the Russo-Turkish war.

The Third National Assembly (Sobor) of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, held in 1953 in Sofia, restored its patriarchal dignity.

During the current period in the history of the Bulgarian Patriarchate, under the leadership of the late Patriarch Kiril (1953-1970) and the present Patriarch, His Holiness Maxime, our mother Orthodox Church has conducted most effectively its administrative, financial and cultural affairs, thus enabling it to fulfill its spiritual mission to the Bulgarian people. Because of its historical role and activities, it has deservedly been recognized as a National Church.

Following the Ilinden Instruction of 1903 the migration to the United States, Canada and Australia increased. Almost all of our Church Communities have been established by Bulgarians from Macedonia.

The organization and the ministry of the Bulgarian Church Mission in the country, from its beginnings to 1937, had been under the direction of a well educated, inspired and loyal to our national and religious cause clergyman—Proto—Presviter Dr. Krastiu Tsenov.

From 1937 to 1972 our Communities in the new world have been under the spiritual leadership of His Eminence Bishop Andrey Velichky. In 1963 he was elected by the Holy Synod of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church as Metropolitan of the Diocese of New York.

In 1969 the Holy Synod split the New-York Diocese and created the new Diocese of Akron, Ohio, Bishop Joseph Znepolski was appointed as its administrator.

Following the death of Metropolitan Andrey of New-York (Aug. 9, 1972), the Holy Synod, according to established procedures, elected His Eminence Bishop Joseph Znepolski to serve as Metropolitan of the Diocese of New-York and appointed him to the position of administrator of the Diocese of Akron.

#### KNIGHT FAMILY LONGTIME LEADERS IN MONROE COUNTY, FLA.

**HON. DANTE B. FASCELL**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1975

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, for many years the family of Harry F. Knight has

contributed its leadership and services to Monroe County, Fla.

I was reminded of this recently on reading a clipping of pages from the Daily Gulf Pennant of January 10, 1893. This Key West publication reported that—

Monroe County's sheriff, Mr. Frank W. Knight, was last Saturday the recipient of a gold badge of office from Hon. Jefferson B. Browne.

Sheriff Knight, who served in that position for 12 years, from 1893 to 1901 and 1905 to 1909, was grandfather of Harry F. Knight, our present county tax collector. State Senator Browne was later president of the Florida senate and chief justice of the Florida Supreme Court.

A testimonial letter from Senator Browne to Sheriff Knight was published in the Pennant and gave interesting insights on candidates, politics, political parties, and leadership. They are still valid today, so I know our colleagues will enjoy sharing the views.

Noting that Mr. Knight had lost his bid to be elected sheriff 4 years previously by 12 votes, Senator Browne stated:

For four years you awaited a vindication at the polls; no word of complaint was heard from your lips; you allowed no whisperings . . . to dissatisfy you with your party; you shirked no work for your party and hoped not for the defeat of any of its candidates as a soothing for your own wounded feelings; you sought not to weaken your party by mutterings of discontent and complaining against those who had devoted their lives to the success of the party, but bravely and manfully you bore your defeat, illustrating by your example that he who can best bear defeat can best stand prosperity, and that he who skulks and complains under defeat is arrogant when successful and unfit for power. Well may your example be followed by some who fain would be leaders, and who, having been rewarded beyond their deserts, forget obligations to their party and are constantly crying out about their party's obligations to them.

Sheriff Knight responded in a letter, also published in the newspaper:

To you more than to any one is the democracy of this country indebted for the success at our late election, confronted as we were by the many complications that arose and the stubbornness of many who tried to control and direct the contest. Your untiring energy and devotion to our party tended more to our complete victory than all other efforts combined . . . in my opinion the election of our entire . . . ticket in this country is due to your management.

Harry F. Knight, who has been Monroe County tax collector since 1968 and is now in his second term ending in 1976, is continuing a family tradition of providing outstanding service to the people of his county, State, and Nation. Prior to being elected to his present county position, he was a city commissioner of Key West for 8 years from 1959 to 1967, and mayor pro tempore for the last 4 of those years.

Harry F. Knight's community activities include recent service as drive chairman for the United Fund; past chairman of the March of Dimes Drive; past president of Key West Jaycees; past president of Key West Youth Council; past president of Key West USO Council; and past chairman of the military affairs committee of the Chamber of Commerce.



July 18, 1975

He has served as exalted ruler of Key West Elks Lodge 551 as well as district deputy grand exalted ruler, and is a member of the vestry of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, founded in 1832, the oldest church in Key West. He is past president of the Key West Golf Club, past chairman of the advisory council for the Order of DeMolay, and is a member of Anchor Lodge F. & A.M.; Key West Consistory; Key West Shrine Club; Mahi Temple; and Ambassador Corps.

Like his grandfather, Harry F. Knight is active in the Democratic Party, having served as county chairman from 1958 to 1970 and as State committeeman from 1970 to the present. He is also party chairman for the 15th Congressional District.

His wife, Ramona Knight, is also contributing in her own right to the legacy of public service. She has worked for the Monroe County school system for 26 years, starting as secretary to the superintendent. Currently, and since 1965, she is finance director. She is also active in Beta Sigma Phi Sorority.

Their son, Harry F. Knight, Jr., is also involved in public service, having worked for the attorney general of Florida after finishing college. He now serves as liaison officer between the Monroe County court and the clerk's office.

The Knight family of Key West is an integral and important part of Key West and Monroe County, not only for accomplishments during a colorful period of south Florida history, but also because they are fortunately still with us today, making their contribution in all phases of community life and sharing responsibility for a better and more dynamic Key West and Monroe County.

I offer my congratulations to Harry F. Knight and his family for their many achievements, and my sincere best wishes for future success and happiness.

LT. GEN. DANIEL JAMES, JR.

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 1975

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago, Air Force Lt. Gen. Daniel James, Jr., was nominated by President Ford to be the first black four-star general in this Nation's history. Once confirmed, General James will become the commander in chief of the North American Air Defense Command.

Mr. Speaker, I take a special pride in General James' most recent accomplishment not only because he is a distinguished American, but in addition, because he is a dear friend of mine. Hence, as I have always commended him as a fine person, I commend him now again as a great achiever and uniquely talented servant of his country.

Mr. Speaker, on July 7, two articles appeared in the St. Louis Sentinel on this four-star general-to-be. I strongly commend these articles to my colleagues'

attention and now insert them in the RECORD:

GENERAL JAMES IS MOVING UP TO FOUR-STAR RANK

The armed forces will have their first black officer of four-star rank upon Senate confirmation of Lieut. Gen. Daniel James Jr. of the Air Force as a full general. The 55-year-old General James, nominated last week by President Ford, will be commander in chief of the North American Air Defense Command, a joint United States-Canadian command, and of the Aerospace Defense Command, with his headquarters near Colorado Springs.

As a graduate of Tuskegee Institute during World War II, the 6-foot-5-inch Chapple James became one of the first black pilots in the old Army Air Corps. He flew 101 combat missions in the Korean War. And after leading 78 strikes into North Vietnam, he spoke on many black campuses during the unrest over the war in Vietnam. As a protégé of Melvin R. Laird, then the Secretary of Defense, he became a Deputy Assistant Secretary and a top Pentagon spokesman. Last fall he became vice commander of the Military Airlift Command, playing a major role in the evacuation from Vietnam.

Lieutenant General Daniel (Chapple) James, Jr., is Vice Commander, Military Airlift Command, Scott Air Force Base, Ill.

General James was born on Feb. 11, 1920, in Pensacola, Fla., where he graduated from Washington High School in June 1937. He attended Tuskegee Institute at Tuskegee, Ala., from September 1937 to March 1942, where he received a bachelor of science degree in physical education and completed civilian pilot training under the Government-sponsored Civilian Pilot Training Program.

He remained at Tuskegee as a civilian instructor pilot in the Army Air Corps Aviation Cadet Program until January 1943, when he entered the program as a cadet and received his commission as a second lieutenant in July 1943. He next completed fighter pilot combat training at Selfridge Field, Mich., and was assigned to various units in the United States for the next six years.

In September 1949, General James went to the Philippines and was assigned as flight leader in the 12th Fighter Bomber Squadron, 18th Fighter Wing, at Clark Field. In July 1950, he went to Korea where he flew 101 combat missions in F-51 and F-80 aircraft during the Korean War.

General James returned to the United States and in July 1951 went to Otis Air Force Base, Mass., where he was assigned as an all-weather jet fighter pilot with the 58th Fighter Interceptor Squadron and became operations officer. In April 1953, he became commander of the 437th Fighter Interceptor Squadron, and in August 1955 he assumed command of the 60th Fighter Interceptor Squadron. While stationed at Otis Air Force Base, he received the Massachusetts Junior Chamber of Commerce 1954 award of "Young Man of the Year" for his outstanding community relations efforts. He graduated from the Air Command and Staff College at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., in June 1957.

General James was assigned to Headquarters U.S. Air Force as a staff officer in the Air Defense Division of the office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations. In July 1960, he was transferred to the Royal Air Force Station at Bentwaters, England, where he served successively as Assistant Director of Operations and then Director of Operations, 81st Tactical Fighter Wing; Commander, 92nd Tactical Fighter Squadron; and Deputy Commander for Operations for the 81st Wing.

In September 1964, General James was transferred to Davis-Monthan Air Force Base,

Ariz., where he was Director of Operations Training and later Deputy Commander for Operations for the 4453rd Combat Crew Training Wing.

General James went to Ubon Royal Thai Air Force Base, Thailand, in December 1966, as Deputy Commander for Operation, 8th Tactical Fighter Wing, and in June 1967 was named Wing Vice Commander. He flew 78 combat missions into North Vietnam, many in the Hanoi/Haiphong area, and lead a flight in which seven Communist Mig 21s were destroyed, the highest total kill of any mission during the Vietnam War.

He was named Vice Commander of the 33rd Tactical Fighter Wing at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., in December 1967. While stationed at Eglin Air Force Base, the Florida State Jaycees named General James as Florida's Outstanding American of the Year for 1969.

GEN. DANIEL JAMES

Congratulations are in order for Daniel (Chapple) James, who has been nominated for the fourth star which would make him the first Black officer in the military to achieve that rank.

We have the highest respect for this fine officer and the magnificent record he has made in the uniform of his country. We have heard him speak on numerous occasions and it has always been a sound and reasoned message to old and young alike, yet we were somewhat distressed over the tenor of his remarks at the recent Chi Delta Mu annual convention here. In an impassioned speech, he was less than enthusiastic about such stalwarts as Roy Wilkins, Vernon Jordan, the late Martin Luther King and others.

The role of the Black soldier has not been an easy one and Gen. James, as so many others, felt the pang of racial discrimination as he did his duty for "God and country." Yet, we would respectfully remind him that it was during the (Lyndon) Johnson years that members of the National Newspaper Publishers Association—The Black Press of America—placed their collective weight behind the issue of line officers in the military. With a full day of briefings and discussions at the Defense Department topped off with a confrontation with the then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, the publishers spoke in direct terms about the contributions of all the Dainel Jameses and the fact that these men and women were due a fairer shake than what they were getting. Top generals had displayed charts, graphs, and "logical" speeches about the tough path to follow on the way to becoming nominated and ultimately an officer. They explained just how many whites are "washed out" each year. And then they were reminded of the odd coincidence that in all of the history of the military that only two Blacks had made it to the rank of general and one was the son of his father. (The Benjamin O. Davies.)

It was the face off, when Secretary McNamara, heatedly answered a particularly probing question with "Are you calling me a racist?"

This meeting was held against the backdrop of the social unrest in this country and the efforts of the Kinges, Wilkinses et al. What the publishers were doing, was simply zeroing in on a particular issue.

Gen. James has had a distinguished career in the military. He has served his country well. His leadership and achievement is needed as a role model for other youngsters, especially black youngsters. In this world of confusion and frustration, young people are reaching far and near for new ideas and new concepts to right some of the social wrongs. Thinking adults are likewise concerned about the plight of this nation. And it is because of a love for this country that we point up its failings. It should not be construed as an act of disloyalty or some-

thing less. Gen. James was one of those who boldly walked into an officer's club and went to the guard house because it was reserved for whites. That experience did not deter him from future service and future loyalty. We imagine that there were those who frowned upon that act in that time.

We are proud of Gen. James and we wish him well. We know that he will wear his fourth star with the dignity and honor that has marked his entire career. We need his skill, his dedication to country, but above all, we need him as a man whom young people can understand and have a burning desire to emulate.

#### AMERICA'S VOICE ABROAD

### HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, one of America's most distinguished men of letters, author James Michener, of Bucks County, Pa., recently wrote an interesting and informative analysis of the Stanton Commission's study of the U.S. Information Agency, U.S. cultural programs abroad, and the broadcasting policies of the Voice of America.

In the belief this article will be of interest to my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### AMERICA'S VOICE ABROAD

(By James A. Michener)

Ten months ago I was invited to participate in a study which asked, "In an age when television, radio, newspapers and travel make public diplomacy inescapable, what changes might be advisable in the way our information and cultural programs function abroad?"

Under the chairmanship of Frank Stanton, 21 of us were asked to see if we could unravel our present system and knit a fabric better suited to our times.

Our commission was a limited one. We were charged to consider the United States Information Agency, the cultural operations of the State Department, and the broadcasting policies of The Voice of America.

I entered our discussions with several strong biases accumulated from my work abroad. (1) I hoped that we could end the incredible system whereby the cultural operations of our government in foreign countries are directed from Washington by an arm of the State Department but executed in the field by personnel responsible to the USIA. The policy makers thus had to depend for the implementation of their decisions upon people over whom they had little control, and this was indefensible. (2) I have a strong interest in furthering the cultural accomplishments of my country. They are considerable, we can be proud of them and they attract favorable attention abroad. (3) As one who had often witnessed the long hours spent by USIA personnel in the field and the courage with which they repulsed attacks on their centers, I wanted to propose no changes that would endanger their professional careers. (4) I had often listened to the Voice of America overseas, and kept a special radio in my home so that I could monitor it almost

daily. I had respect for what The Voice tried to do.

I started with a conviction that all we had to do was move cultural activities out of State place them in USIA, continue with the Voice of America as at present, and get on with the job.

But as we listened to testimony I was forced to question my preconceptions. Our witnesses said that in an age of public diplomacy our overseas operations had two crucial responsibilities, and we must make a distinction between them. The first was an obligation to explain and advocate our foreign policy. The second is to let the world see and understand our cultural accomplishments.

The explication of policy is highly political and often of immediate importance. It must be intimately interlocked with the total operation of the embassy.

The display of our cultural accomplishments must not be political, is rarely of immediate importance, and can be conducted without the participation of all arms of the embassy.

The fact that overseas the same American officer is responsible for both these diverse programs tends, in the opinion of most of our advisors, to diminish the effectiveness and credibility of both the spokesman and the cultural emissary. It is extremely doubtful that the same man should argue the merits of a tough commercial treaty in the morning and sponsor a ballet group that evening.

So very early in our deliberations it became clear that some kind of reorganization, some realignment of responsibilities could alone bring order into what had become a melange. But what to do?

We started with a basic assumption that no one of us ever questioned: the three separate arms of USIA and its cultural parallel in State—political, cultural, and Voice of America—were essential. None could be eliminated. All should be encouraged to perform more effectively.

Our first big decision was that all activities dealing with the articulation of policy should be centered in the State Department, in Washington and directly under the ambassador in any embassy abroad. Officers responsible for such duties would be detached from USIA and returned to State, where they would henceforth function.

Our second decision was that all cultural activities, no matter where located at present, must be united under one leadership. But this was a conclusion more easily reached than implemented.

Should the new organization be placed in State? I was determined to oppose this with all the vigor I had, because I could visualize the program's falling under the direction of some superannuated ambassador who had never believed in either culture or public diplomacy, and I breathed more easily when other members of the panel anticipated my arguments and made them for me. That wrong alternative was killed off, and I hope it stays dead.

But where should the cultural effort go? There were two possibilities: either an organization much like the present USIA, or a different type similar to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Each is autonomous, but with this difference: USIA reports directly to the President; ACDA reports to the Secretary of State. One practical reason caused us to opt for the latter. We believed that by doing so we would enhance the program's viability if the Secretary of State testified on Capitol Hill as to his need for a cultural support to his foreign policy.

That left us with a tantalizing problems. Where to put the Voice? Those of us acquainted with this important arm of government had long appreciated that it had three difficult obligations: (1) political in

support of our government's positions; (2) cultural to entertain foreign listeners with news about our national life and with copious samples of our music, which listeners seemed to treasure; and (3) the quick dissemination of news not colored by the interests of alien governments.

We decided early and firmly that it must not be in State, for there it would become a mere mouthpiece and its credibility as a source of impartial news would be sacrificed. Nor did we want it an adjunct to the cultural agency, for it might hamper or even contaminate our cultural efforts, depriving us of contacts with the very people we were trying to interest.

The only sensible solution was to establish the Voice as an independent federal agency under the intimate control of a Board of Overseers reflecting and responsive to its three functions.

I am very partial to the Voice. Prior to Watergate I was satisfied that it tried to do a respectable job of maintaining a balance of its three obligations. It did speak for the government on great basic issues. It did entertain and provide a congenial portrait of America. And it did flash out the news that so many foreign listeners depended upon. Its real test came with the Watergate tragedy and it earned high marks. I have been told subsequently that on lesser points it has surrendered to a censorship which it should have withstood, and this must be watched closely. But it is a valuable arm of government, and if a highly qualified board is appointed, it can become even more effective.

There you have our conclusions. Political officers back to State. Voice of America set free under a board consisting of the best Presidential appointees available. A new agency for cultural affairs, autonomous but reporting to the Secretary of State.

The personal objectives with which I started have been met. The deplorable administrative confusion between State's cultural efforts in Washington and USIA's forces in the field has been eliminated. The cultural component has been strengthened. The jobs of devoted experts have been protected. And the integrity of the Voice has been safeguarded.

Three conclusions are important. First, our plan will cost the government no additional money. True, the Voice will require some two hundred more people than it now has, but they are already doing the Voice's job within the USIA and will merely be transferred to new quarters. In fact, it seems reasonable to me that slight sums should be saved by eliminating some present duplications between State and USIA in cultural affairs but as one expert warned the other day, "Don't hold your breath till that happens."

Second, there is no truth in the accusation "you've thrown everything back into State." We are giving State no more than ten per cent of what USIA is now doing, and we are taking from State one hundred per cent of its cultural operation.

Third, we have not proposed these changes as a counter-reaction to the moves of any foreign government. If detente continues, our changes will enable our foreign policy to be more responsive. If detente crumbles, our changes will permit swift adjustment.

We have done our best to rationalize one small corner of our government, making it more effective, more responsive to the last quarter of this century. We may have missed testimony that would have altered our conclusions, but not through indifference. We believe that we have outlined a procedure which, if adopted by the President and Congress, will put our overseas operations on a more logical and viable basis than the *status quo*.



## EROSION OF FEDERALISM

## HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial by James J. Kilpatrick appeared in yesterday's edition of the Washington Star which calls attention to several disconcerting proposals for extension of Federal power into areas traditionally the prerogative of the States. The definition of "rights" is certainly crucial to the controversy which Mr. Kilpatrick sees as around the corner, and it is to be hoped that the consequences of the "transfer of power" which he mentions need not take place. The editorial entitled "Erosion of Federalism" follows at this point in the RECORD:

## EROSION OF FEDERALISM

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

So much attention has been paid to Section 1 of the pending Equal Rights Amendment that little note has been taken of Section 2. It's something for State legislators, editors, lawyers, and interested citizens to think about.

By this time, almost everyone who cares about such things has heard of Section 1 of the ERA: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

We tend to pass over Section 2: "The Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

The same language appears in half a dozen other amendments to the Constitution. It is the implementing clause. We are seeing the exercise of this power these days in the Voting Rights Act, implementing the Fifteenth Amendment. Here Congress, by federal law, is overriding state laws that deal with elections.

The Equal Rights Amendment now has been ratified by 34 states, though three of these have rescinded approval. If prior to March, 1979, another four states should ratify (depending on how Congress treats the rescissions), the ERA will become part of the Constitution. What then?

The states traditionally have had the responsibility for laws relating to marriage and the family. Such laws deal with every aspect of divorce, including the grounds for divorce, alimony, child custody, community property.

The laws vary widely, but many tend to discriminate in favor of women. Under ERA, such laws would be forbidden.

At a meeting in Washington last week of Parents Without Partners, a suggestion came from the floor: Wouldn't it be a great idea to have one, national, uniform law on divorce?

A single federal law would assure identical treatment for men and women, making certain that no discrimination remained "on account of sex."

Another traditional field of state responsibility is education. The field has been much invaded by federal authority in recent years. Exercising the implementing power of the Fourteenth Amendment, Congress has forbidden the states to discriminate by reason of race in any educational institution supported by public funds.

Thus far, the states have retained considerable authority in such matters as dormitories, athletics, sororities and fraternities.

Under the pending amendment, "equality of rights" (whatever the phrase may mean)

could not be abridged "on account of sex." It is useful to reflect upon what "rights" the male or female student now enjoys.

Would the freedom to choose a "men only" or a "women only" dormitory be affected by this amendment? Could state sanction be extended to fraternities that discriminated against women, or to sororities that banned membership to men? Congress would have power to enforce the amendment "by appropriate legislation."

Over the past 20 years, many private colleges, once limited to men or to women students only, have gone coeducational. Even so, at least 100 such institutions remain.

All of them are affected in some way by state and federal laws. The question may fairly be raised: How would they be affected by the Equal Rights Amendment?

Laws that sanction discrimination "on account of sex" are far more pervasive and complex than laws that used to discriminate "on account of race." For one thing, racial laws always discriminated against the Negro, never in his favor, and such laws were largely confined to the Southern and border states.

The situation as to women is quite different.

Do we want national legislation in all these fields? To those of us reared in the old-fashioned doctrines of federalism, the prospect has no appeal. There is little to be said for the notion that superior wisdom lies in the Congress. But under this amendment, that is where the superior power would lie.

At the moment, ERA languishes. Next year the movement for ratification will resume. In the interim, it will do no harm to keep this in mind: In the name of creating rights, this amendment would achieve a massive transfer of powers.

## FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARDS TO TWO PENNSYLVANIA EDUCATORS

## HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I believe we are all familiar with the efforts of the Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge, Pa., in encouraging patriotism, responsible citizenship, and solutions to the basic problems facing our Nation. Their awards program is designed to recognize and draw public attention to those who make contributions in these areas.

Freedoms Foundation has two national awards for educators: The Valley Forge Teachers Medal, which is awarded to elementary and secondary school teachers and the American Educators Medal, given to school principals and superintendents.

I am pleased to report that two Pennsylvanians have received both of these national awards. Mr. John F. McHugh, principal of the William Allen High School, Allentown, received the Valley Forge Teachers Medal in 1958 and the American Educators Medal in 1966. Mr. Raymond R. Troxell, Jr., superintendent of the West York Area School District, York, received the Valley Forge Teachers Medal in 1963 and the American Educators Medal in 1974.

I commend Mr. McHugh and Mr. Troxell on their accomplishments and

their high regard for the ideals of citizenship and the principles of Americanism.

## MR. SOLZHENITSYN AND THE PRESIDENT

## HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, very recently, a very great man came to Washington. He paid for the privilege of visiting this city and living in the West by the many years he spent in a Soviet concentration camp. Alexandr Solzhenitsyn emerged from that experience stronger in conscience and purer in thought than any man in living memory.

As a result of Mr. Solzhenitsyn's experiences, the creative impulse within him helped to produce several works of genius that have hit the literary world. Those works tell of the sorrow and torment of millions of innocent human beings, those caught up in the system which stifles freedom and oppresses those who dare to resist.

Solzhenitsyn survived and emerged from the East with a message. It is a timeless message, nobly and eloquently expressed by this man in his words and deeds. It is also a simple message. It says that the human spirit will not be oppressed in any age or by any dictator. Alexandr Solzhenitsyn is a living embodiment of the truth of that idea, the same one on which this Nation was founded almost 200 years ago.

Mr. Solzhenitsyn came to the West not only to escape tyranny and to tell what was done to his colleagues, but to warn us that those who sought to enslave him were also a danger to us as well. He came in spite of threats to his life and the possibility of a repetition of his previous incarceration.

As a result, the entire civilized world has hailed him. The entire literary world has lionized him. The entire academic community has admired him. Yet, when Mr. Solzhenitsyn came to this city to express his deepest and most heartfelt feelings, he looked for a sign of official recognition. However, his search was in vain. He was told that the President had no time, his schedule was full. Although the President later decided that he might have time in the future, I consider the initial denial for a meeting inexcusable and deplorable.

It is to my astonishment and sorrow, that the President seems to have time for everyone else, from movie stars and golfers to youth groups and athletes. Yet, he had no time to recognize the existence and presence of the one individual who today best embodies moral courage in the world.

I cannot sit silent in the face of this type of action by a President from whom I expected much more. Gerald Ford is a decent, honest, and good man. This is what makes his actions so hard to understand. He knows of the plight of so many innocent people who are today ground under the heel of oppression within the

Soviet Union, yet he chose not to offer even the slightest gesture to this brilliant and courageous man when Mr. Solzhenitsyn initially requested a few moments of his time.

By this act, America suffers. And, I feel that Mr. Solzhenitsyn should know that there are many among us who will have the courage of their convictions and offer him the immediate respect and approval he so rightfully deserves. I know I will.

MISS MARY COMEGYS

HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, today I want to take the opportunity to commend an outstanding teacher and civic-minded citizen who has retired after 41 years of teaching in Illinois.

Such a career, spanning the lives of so many students who have come under her good influences, cannot really be summarized. Nor can one measure the length and breadth of that influence, for it extends into the tomorrows of people now grown, with children of their own, that once had the privilege of knowing and being taught by Miss Mary Comegys.

Her teaching career began in the Seneca Schools and after 11 years she moved to Thornton Township High School—1945. She began teaching at Thornton Community College in 1963 where she remained until her retirement this summer.

As a political science instructor, Miss Comegys was one of those teachers who is not content with the textbook portrayal of facts. She strove to bring the political process to life for her students. They interviewed elected officials, and those officials showed up in her classrooms to speak. Government—too often reduced to a chart, a graph, and a series of definitions to students—becomes in the hands of such a teacher the challenging, evolving process that it actually is. By instilling in her students a contagious enthusiasm for the role of government and raising their political consciousness, she has contributed immeasurably to the health of our government. An informed citizenry is the foundation of our democracy.

The honors and achievements of this fine lady are numerous. To cite just a few: she was the charter director of the Association of Political Science Instructors; member of Great Teachers of Illinois Seminar; the first teacher to organize seminars with editors at Chicago Tribune and Daily News; the first faculty member of Thornton Community College to receive honorary membership in Phi Theta Kappa, the national scholastic fraternity.

She graduated cum laude from the College of St. Francis, earned her master's degree from the University of Illinois, and attended the University of California at Berkeley as well as Illinois State University and University of Chicago for course study.

Now she is taking a well deserved rest—except that she is going to continue traveling and remain active in civic affairs. I wish her much happiness for she has surely earned it.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 17th observance of Captive Nations Week. While past recognition of this week has certainly been fitting, this year's observance assumes special significance.

It has special significance because all Americans are contemplating the arduous struggle for freedom our forebears endured nearly 200 years ago. Just as our spirit of liberty survived the hardships of deprivation and aggression, the spirit in the captive nations' millions survives undaunted. We cannot allow this spirit to wane.

This year's observance has special significance because there are those who question America's commitment to individual rights and freedoms. As a nation which forged its freedom with the lives and sacrifices of its citizens, we must continue as a beacon of hope and inspiration for the world's oppressed. We cannot allow this beacon to dim.

There is special significance of this year's observance because the Soviet Union is seeking formal recognition of its forceful annexations. To acquiesce to the violation of basic human rights would be to renounce the very principles on which our society is based. While the pursuit of détente is certainly worthy, the right of self-determination must never be obviated.

The millions of captive nations citizens cannot raise their voices for their basic rights—the few who have tried became victims of inestimable suffering. They look to America to defend their dignity. They look to a nation whose benchmark is the preservation of liberty. We cannot let them down; for to do so would be to denigrate our highest ideals.

The United States and all free countries which are fortunate enough to rest secure on their principles of independence, bereft of political oppression, must continue to provide unwavering, active support for the 29 nations not so propitious.

The observance of Captive Nations Week gives cause for reflection—reflection on the tasks required of our Nation to preserve its freedom, and reflection on the fate of millions whose freedom is denied. More important, however, Captive Nations Week brings forth a challenge. It is a challenge to a people whose liberties are a reality. It is a challenge to

support those whose liberties are unfulfilled dreams. It is a challenge which must be met by all Americans.

EVERY CONGRESSMAN A MILKMAID

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the editorial column of the Washington Star of July 17 takes note of a serious falling of this legislative body. The domestic simile is apt and so is the blunt description of the problem arising from the failure of Congress to make maximum use of the budget control machinery. Either way, the result is maximum cost to the taxpayers. The editorial is included at this point in the RECORD:

EVERY CONGRESSMAN A MILKMAID

Congress, which recently established the Congressional Budget Office and budget committees in both chambers to try to control its impulse-buying, is still having a hard time doing so. During this session, according to the report we saw, it has overrun President Ford's 1976 spending requests by over \$8 billion. Now, Sen. Ed Muskie, chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, has put his colleagues on notice that Congress is on a \$12 billion-plus collision course with its own self-imposed budget ceiling.

When H. L. Mencken defined democracy as "a milk cow with 125 million teats," he anticipated the congressional spending problem. It is not in the nature of the legislative beast—Congress or any other—to submit to one milkmaid at a time. That would cramp the style of the innumerable committees and subcommittees with one or more thumbs on the pursestrings. Congress may not have 125 million simultaneous milkers, but it has scores if not hundreds; and the question whether it will ever learn to coordinate its own accounts remains open.

What is perhaps more important than the overrun figures themselves, important as they are, is that Congress demonstrate convincingly a degree of budgetary self-discipline. Those who conceived the congressional budget act and pushed it through understood that a legislative body without that self-discipline will be a patsy for any strong-minded President who knows how to use the veto, and even impoundment, to second-guess legislative priorities. This was certainly one of the causes of the great impoundment stink of two years ago: Congress, unable to co-ordinate its own expenditures and not then even interested in doing so, was vulnerable to constitutional tampering.

One can only guess what might have happened to the Anglo-American constitutional principle that spending is a legislative function if the 17th Century English parliaments battling Charles I had been as ill-equipped with internal checks as Congress. You can't make much of a case against bypassing the consent of Congress if Congress promiscuously gives its consent to every internal whim; you don't fight effectively over "ship money" if every congressional committee can buy its own rowboat. The first thing to understand about the great principle of no taxation without representation is that the great battlers of legislative control, Pym and Hampden, had their own impulse-buying under firm control.



# ECONOMIC POLICY MUST BE TIED TO ENERGY POLICY

## HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's New York Times contains an excellent editorial on the need to coordinate U.S. economic and energy policies.

As I have already pointed out to my colleagues, any decontrol on the price of crude oil will result in a loss of consumer purchasing power. Estimates on the magnitude of this loss range as high as \$60 billion, and include projections on unemployment that could reach as many as 1½ million Americans out of work. Any increase in the price of imported oil products, such as is now being threatened by OPEC countries, will only exacerbate this problem. Thus, it is essential that the administration start drawing up economic contingency plans to cope with this situation.

First and foremost, the administration must develop plans to provide tax relief to American energy consumers. Such tax relief will not be inflationary; it will simply be restoring lost purchasing power. Additionally, the Federal Reserve Board must adopt appropriate monetary policies to guard against a sudden contraction in money supply that would drive up interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all my colleagues have been encouraged by the recent, albeit faint, signs of economic recovery, such as last month's upturn in industrial production, as well as the slow but steady growth in consumer outlays for autos and homes. However, we should not be lulled into complacency that all is well with the economy. A sudden energy price shock, such as could result from too-rapid price decontrol, could send the economy into a tailspin.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a special responsibility to the American people to oppose any energy price decontrol proposal that threatens the stability of our economy. The administration's price decontrol proposal poses such a threat, and it must be opposed strongly by this House. At the same time, however, we must recognize that even gradual increases in energy price needed to spur domestic production must be accompanied by action to replace vital consumer purchasing power and to maintain a money supply that will allow the business sector to make vital investment decisions necessary for our economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this morning's editorial to the attention of my colleagues, and I include it at this point in my remarks:

[From the New York Times, July 17, 1975]  
RECOVERY START?

The pickup in industrial production last month is the most convincing evidence yet that the recession which began in November 1973 may be nearing its close and that recovery is beginning.

Thus far the increase in consumer outlays has been gradual but widespread; in the two

hardest-hit sectors, auto sales are moving up, the inventory of unsold new homes is being worked down and the prospects for a stronger rise in housing construction are good. Business firms have been cutting inventories heavily and trimming their capital spending, but these measures have been essential to building a stronger financial base for future expansion.

This is not to say that the economy now faces a trouble-free future. One major problem ahead is a possible reprise of the same factor that deepened the recession of the past year and a half—a huge increase in energy prices. In 1973 and 1974 higher oil prices hit the American economy with the equivalent of a sudden \$35-billion increase in excise taxes, intensifying both inflation and recession. The Congressional Budget Office now has published an analysis demonstrating that in the eighteen months ahead, the United States economy may have to cope with a similar \$35-billion to \$40-billion increase in "excises" on energy as a result of the probable decontrol of "old" oil and the increase in the price of imported oil from OPEC countries.

Although the Administration received ample warning last time of the recessionary impact of the energy shock, it refused to heed the warning and focused only on inflation—until the economy actually began to fall like a stone. Yet, having been proved wrong so dramatically last time, the Administration is in danger of repeating its mistake.

It is imperative that both the Administration and the Federal Reserve Board make adequate plans for dealing with the impact of another energy shock to the economy. The recession may be over, but an aborted recovery could lie ahead. If the recent recession was comparable in its sharpness to the 1957-58 drop, it is worth remembering that the recovery from that recession collapsed as a result of policy errors. The economy fell into the 1959-60 recession soon afterward.

Starting out now with the unemployment rate close to 9 per cent—the worst of the postwar period—it is crucial that this recovery go all the way.

# HEARINGS ANNOUNCED ON OVERSIGHT OF THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT: PROSECUTORIAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL AGENCIES—WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

## HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that on Tuesday and Wednesday, July 22 and 23, the Subcommittee on Government Information and Individual Rights which I chair will hold oversight hearings directed to determine the relationship between the Department of Justice and the CIA over the past 20 years. These hearings will specifically focus on the obligation of the CIA to report to the Department of Justice possible criminal violations by its employees. Under title 28, section 535, United States Code, all agencies have been directed to report criminal violations to the Department of Justice.

Preliminary investigation indicates that this was not the case with the CIA. Witnesses will include present and for-

mer officials of the Department of Justice and present and former officials of the CIA. The hearings will be held in room 2154 on July 22 and on July 23 in room 2218. The hearings will begin each day at 9 a.m. and are open to the public.

# SOLZHENITSYN ANSWERS HIS CRITICS

## HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, as one Member of Congress who is deeply concerned, not only about the future security of the West, but for its very soul as well, I welcomed Alexandr Solzhenitsyn's visit to our country. I have asked the Speaker to invite him to address a joint session of the Congress, and I strongly support the resolution to confer upon him honorary U.S. citizenship.

I was very much offended by the insensitivity in the White House shown this man of conscience in calling his visit to America a threat to world peace and a commercial enterprise. According to the New York Times some on the White House staff even questioned his mental stability. And, I do not forget these were the very reasons cited by the Kremlin in expelling him from the Soviet Union.

But, I am even more disappointed at the arguments used to discredit his visit—by those who say that his views on the Soviet Union are irrelevant.

Mr. Speaker, Alexandr Solzhenitsyn needs no defense from me or anyone else, for his words, works, and his very life are illustrative of his courageous defense of freedom and his commitment to truth.

I include at this point his remarks before the AFL-CIO at the Americana Hotel in New York City.

And Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal calling particular attention to the conclusions:

# SOLZHENITSYN REPLIES TO HIS CRITICS

Communism is as crude an attempt to explain society and the individual as if a surgeon were to perform his delicate operations with a meat-axe. All that is subtle in human psychology and in the structure of society (which is even more delicate), all of this is reduced to crude economic processes. This whole created being—man—is reduced to matter. It's characteristic that communism is so devoid of arguments that it has none to advance against its opponents in our Communist countries. It lacks arguments and hence there is the club, the prisons, the concentration camp, and insane asylums with forced confinement. . . .

Communism has never concealed the fact that it rejects all absolute concepts of morality. It scoffs at any consideration of "good" and "evil" as indisputable categories. . . . Communism has managed to instill in all of us that these concepts are old-fashioned concepts and laughable. But if we are to be deprived of the concepts of good and evil, what will be left? Nothing but the manipulation of one another. We will decline to the status of animals.

Both the theory and practice of commu-

nism are completely inhuman for that reason. There is a word very commonly used these days: "anti-communism." It's a very stupid word, badly put together. It makes it appear as though communism were something original, something basic, something fundamental. Therefore, it is taken as the point of departure, and anti-communism is defined in relation to communism.

Here is why I say that this word was poorly selected, that it was put together by people who do not understand etymology: the primary, the eternal concepts is humanity. And communism is anti-humanity. Whoever says "anti-communism" is saying, in effect, anti-anti-humanity. A poor construction....

Not to accept, to reject this inhuman Communist ideology is simply to be a human being. It isn't being a member of a party. It's a protest of our souls against those who tell us to forget the concepts of good and evil.

After my first address, as always, there were some superficial comments in the newspapers, which did not really get to the essence. One of them was as follows: that I came here with an appeal to the United States to liberate us from communism. Anyone who has at all followed what I have said and written these many years, first in the Soviet Union and now in the West, will know that I've always said the exact opposite. I have appealed to my own countrymen—those whose courage has failed at difficult moments, and who have looked imploringly to the West—and urged them: "Don't wait for assistance, and don't ask for it. We must stand on our own feet...."

I said the last time that two processes are occurring in the world today. One is a process of spiritual liberation in the U.S.S.R. and in the other Communist countries. The second is the assistance being extended by the West to the Communist rulers, a process of concessions, of détente, of yielding whole countries. And I only said: "Remember, we have to pull ourselves up—but if you defend us, you also defend your own future...."

In my last address I only requested one thing, and I make the same request now: When they bury us in the ground alive (I compared the forthcoming European agreement with a mass grave for all the countries of East Europe)—as you know, this a very unpleasant sensation: your mouth gets filled with earth while you're still alive—please do not send them shovels. Please do not send them the most modern earth-moving equipment.

I said in my last address and would like to repeat it again, that we have to look at every front from the other point of view—from the point of view of the Soviet Union. Our country is taking your assistance, but in the schools they're teaching and in the newspapers they are writing and in lectures they are saying, "Look at the Western world, it's beginning to rot. Look at the economy of the Western world, it's coming to an end. The great predictions of Marx, Engels and Lenin are coming true. Capitalism is breathing its last. It's already dead. And our socialist economy is flourishing. It has demonstrated once and for all the triumph of communism."

I think, gentlemen, and I particularly address those of you who have a socialist outlook, that we should at last permit this socialist economy to prove its superiority. Let's allow it to show that it is advanced, that it is omnipotent, that it has defeated you, that it has overtaken you. Let us not interfere with it. Let us stop selling to it and giving it loans. If its all that powerful, then let it stand on its own feet for 10 or 15 years. Then we will see what it looks like.

I can tell you what it will look like. I am

being quite serious now. When the Soviet economy will no longer be able to deal with everything, it will have to reduce its military preparations. It will have to abandon the useless space effort, and it will have to feed and clothe its own people. And the system will be forced to relax....

Another distortion appeared in your press with respect to my last address. Someone wrote that "one more advocate of the Cold War has come here. One more person has arrived to call on us to resume the Cold War." That is a misunderstanding. The Cold War—the war of hatred—is still going on, but only on the Communist side.

What is the Cold War? It's a war of abuse, and they still abuse you.... In sources which you can read, and even more in those which are unavailable to you, and which you don't hear of, in the depths of the Soviet Union, the Cold War has never stopped. It hasn't stopped for one second....

Do I call upon you to return to the Cold War? By no means, Lord forbid! What for? The only thing I'm asking you to do is to give the Soviet economy a chance to develop. Do not bury us in the ground, just let the Soviet economy develop, and then let's see....

Relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America should be such that there would be no deceit in the question of armaments, that there would be no concentration camps, no psychiatric wards for healthy people. Relations should be such that the throats of our women would no longer be constricted with tears, that there would be an end to the incessant ideological warfare waged against you, and that an address such as mine today would in no way be an exception.

#### THE MEANING OF SOLZHENITSYN

Alexandr Solzhenitsyn, the Russian writer whose career had been the outstanding moral phenomenon of the Soviet Union, recently gave two major addresses in this country. The response has been a phenomenon in its own right. Mr. Solzhenitsyn is deeply admired by many thoughtful people for his prolonged and steadfast defiance of the Soviet government, a defiance which led to his exile abroad early last year. Yet among many others his presence in the United States appears to be causing acute discomfort, and he is experiencing their open hostility.

Reports of Mr. Solzhenitsyn's talks contain an undertone of irritation with his "preachiness." Columnists accuse him of reviving "Cold War" rhetoric. President Ford, in the most unworthy decision of his tenure, gave heed to certain advisers who warned that a White House invitation for Mr. Solzhenitsyn might offend the Kremlin.

Much of this irritation is caused by Mr. Solzhenitsyn's message, portions of which appear elsewhere on this page. The Russian exile has delivered a grim warning that communism continued to advance steadily, as it has for the past six decades, and that, the West is showing itself too cowardly and morally uncertain to defend its civilized values. This is not what people want to hear. One can virtually see the psychological defenses going up, seizing on this occasional overdrawn argument and unfocused criticism of the West to dismiss the powerful underlying message.

Yet this warning alone, it strikes us, is not the only or even the chief reason Solzhenitsyn is so discomforting. More or less by accident, he has come to play a role in his country's moral history without parallel in this century. By living up to this role, he has acquired a stature that makes modern men look like pygmies. Politics aside, his very presence carries a discomfiting moral message.

Solzhenitsyn may share many human frailties. He may even, as some who read Rus-

sion tell us, be a less gifted writer than fellow Nobel laureate Michael Sholokhov, an unreconstructed Stalinist who in the '60s advocated summary execution for dissident intellectuals. But he devoted his career to a task of immense importance for the Russian people, telling the truth about the unimaginable repressions and moral distortions of Soviet rule.

Solzhenitsyn won overnight fame in Russia in 1962 with publication of his short, autobiographical novel describing one day's life in a prison camp. This short period of official favor, the result of Khrushchev's de-Stalinization campaign, quickly yielded to increasingly severe official hostility, as Solzhenitsyn went deeper into the prison camp experience and allowed his manuscripts to appear abroad. He persisted in this work when his freedom and even his life seemed in jeopardy.

This firmness, a firmness common to many less-famous dissidents and thousands of anonymous prison camp inmates, has provided Russia with something we in the West had thought disappeared under communism, an uncompromised standard of morality. Like sunlight clearing a fog, the return of these "saints" from the camps after 1956 made clear to many Russians that Stalinism, even Marxism, could only flourish in an atmosphere of hypocrisy, official deceit and personal dishonesty. Yet in the midst of this, there still was something indomitable in the human soul.

Inevitably, Solzhenitsyn faced the question, why was the West so indifferent to the horrors of Communism? In his New York speech, he attempted an answer, that communism "has infected the whole world with the belief in the relativity of good and evil." The notorious double standard of Western liberals derives from a philosophical double standard; they actually seem to admit the Communist claim that "all morality depends on class ideology," that socialist justice can do away with bourgeois notions of fairness and still deserve the name of justice. Against this, Solzhenitsyn defends the old idea that a moral standard is indivisible, a murder is still a murder, even if committed by Communist guards in a state-run prison camp.

"It is almost a joke now in the Western World, in the 20th Century, to use words like 'good' and 'evil,'" Solzhenitsyn observes. Yet he makes a mistake in attributing this relativism solely to Marxism; during his sojourn in the West he will no doubt learn that much of it is homegrown. Western liberals have been taught that man is merely a mass of protoplasm, his behavior merely the result of his environment, and that thus he cannot be judged by any universal standard of good and evil.

But here is Alexandr Solzhenitsyn, fresh from the environment of the Gulag Archipelago, testifying by his presence that man is more than that, and calling with his voice for a moral law. Those who are uncomfortable in his presence are not so merely because he challenges their view of the Soviet Union, but more profoundly because he challenges their view of man himself.

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) DU PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1975

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, this week, July 14-18, marks the 17th anniversary of Captive Nations Week, initiated by Congress in July 1959. I join my colleagues and others of the free world in expressing my concern and hope for the captive peoples of Albania, Armenia,



Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and most recently Cambodia and South Vietnam.

Our American heritage has been greatly enriched by many who have sought the freedom in this country they were so cruelly denied in their own. These people, who have struggled against oppression in their homelands, have brought to the United States a real appreciation and understanding of human and civil rights. We in the United States must never lose sight of what it signifies to be free. The American people have a right and an obligation not only to observe this sad anniversary of the bondage of millions around the globe by condemning the denigration of human dignity, but also to continue to defend liberty and justice for all of mankind.

THE LATE LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS

### HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I learned of the death last Sunday of Larry Williams, former Congressman for the Seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania. Larry served in the House for 8 years, from 1967 through 1974.

Larry Williams was a friend and a colleague. He ably represented his constituents and worked diligently with the other Members of the Pennsylvania delegation to represent our State. He was a tireless and energetic worker and never hesitated to speak his mind on any issue before him.

Larry served the people of Delaware County for many years in many capacities. He was active in local government, serving as a commissioner of Springfield Township and participating in important regional organizations such as the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission and the Penn-Jersey Transportation Study.

He was also a successful businessman and brought his practical experience with him to Congress. In World War II he served his country in the Army Air Corps. He was a well-respected member of his community.

In Congress, Larry served on the Banking and Currency Committee and on the Standards of Official Government Committee. His background in business and in local government gave him a good headstart in mastering the complex legislation in the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee. He was a dedicated and hard-working member of that committee and fought vigorously for his point of view.

Larry Williams was an industrious and energetic Congressman who served his district and his country well. I am sure that he will be missed by his many friends in Pennsylvania and in this House. I extend my sympathy to his wife and family.

It was a privilege to serve with Larry Williams and to know him as a friend. I shall miss him too.

LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY: JANUARY 1, TO JULY 1, 1975

### HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, continuing my practice of making periodic reports to my constituents, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a summary of the legislative activities of the 94th Congress in its first 6 months.

#### A NEW CONGRESS

The 94th Congress in our history came into existence after the high drama of a Presidential resignation, an oil embargo, and an economic roller-coaster ride.

There were new hopes that Government reform efforts would acquire new vigor, and that the grave problems of energy shortage and economic difficulties would be solved by congressional initiative.

In retrospect, many of these hopes have not been fulfilled. Many Members of Congress share the frustrations of their constituents over the inability to achieve a congressional consensus on these issues.

Yet the failures of the young Congress—only 6 months old—must not obscure its achievements.

Moreover, there is plenty of blame to go around—including some for special interests which have been unwilling to help bear the necessary burdens of energy conservation, and some for a President who has too quickly resorted to the "veto weapon," thus setting the stage for confrontation with the Congress rather than cooperation with it.

#### ENERGY

The last Congress, the 93d, began in earnest our commitment to the development of new, clean energy resources such as solar energy.

The Congress must now take two more steps in this effort: one, expand into new areas, such as the development of clean-burning alcohol fuels; and two, insure that our spending priorities are properly balanced among competing energy sources.

The most complex and controversial energy issues are the questions of energy prices and methods of energy conservation.

President Ford's strategy is based on a system of energy taxes and decontrol of energy prices. By making energy more costly, it is hoped that consumers will be more inclined to conserve energy and producers more inclined to produce in view of potential profits.

The impact of massive increases in prices and taxes on the economy and on individual consumers, however, could be disastrous. Our economy has already been jolted by a doubling and tripling of most energy prices, and by an inflation which existed before the Arab oil em-

bargo. Adding a sudden \$50 billion energy bill to an economy already beset by recession and inflation seems, at best, a dangerous step to take.

An alternative to the President's strategy, the Energy Conservation and Conversion Act, was passed by the House in June. Gasoline tax increases, part of the bill as first drafted, were defeated on the House floor.

But, as finally passed, the bill established oil import quotas, excise taxes on oil and gas for business use, an energy trust fund financed by these taxes, tax credits and exemptions for energy-saving products, and fines for autos failing to achieve fuel economy standards by 1978 and thereafter.

Two House committees estimated that the bill, if it becomes law, will save more than 2 million barrels of oil per day by 1985.

#### THE ECONOMY

Throughout the first 6 months of 1975, the economic statistics were consistently the bearers of bad tidings.

As many as 8.5 million people have been out of work in a given month. Unemployment insurance payments, supplemental unemployment payments, food stamps, and outright welfare sustained many Americans this year.

While the leading economic indicators more recently have been on the upswing, reporting a more optimistic note, a full recovery is yet many months off.

And while inflation is somewhat abated, it continues to erode the earnings of every American at an intolerable pace.

The Tax Reduction Act was the first congressional response to the economic malaise infecting the Nation. The Congress also approved in its first 6 months legislation to aid the housing market, to protect the unemployed from mortgage foreclosure, and to give many of the jobless short-term Federal jobs. Unemployment benefits have been given extended duration.

In the long run, solving the energy shortage, tax reform, and encouraging economic competition may be the foundation of real economic recovery. But the Congress has acted to provide immediate relief for the victims of a sluggish economy and stimulation for permanent recovery.

#### BUDGET, TAXATION, AND FINANCE

The 94th Congress approved the largest tax cut in history—the \$22.8 billion Tax Reduction Act. This measure resulted in \$8.1 billion in tax rebates to individual taxpayers on 1974 taxes. Furthermore, the bill made significant reduction in taxes Americans will pay in 1975.

Businesses also received tax cuts, notably an increase in the credit for investments in plant and equipment, to spur production. Both corporate and individual cuts were designed to stimulate the economy.

This temporary measure, however, does not satisfy the need for fundamental and comprehensive reform of the Nation's tax laws. That need is being met by the House Ways and Means Committee which will conduct hearings on this important matter.

The first hearing, being held this summer, will examine tax shelters, minimum tax, tax simplification, and capital gains. A second set of tax reform hearings is scheduled for November.

The Congress approved the first budget resolution in history in May. This represents the first step in implementing the Budget Reform Act passed by the last Congress, and represents an earnest attempt by the Congress to take a more active part in the profoundly important—and politically painful—decisions relative to raising and expending the tax dollars.

Federal revenue sharing, which distributes Federal tax revenues to States and communities, will expire unless legislation is passed in this Congress to extend the program. I support continuation of the program because it contributes to the fiscal health of local governments and to the delivery of a higher level of needed public services in our communities.

In the face of a sagging economy, the Congress is seeking ways to streamline the private marketplace.

The President has proposed a reduction in the Federal regulation of interstate commerce. Legislation to reform the private securities market became public law this year.

A resolution urging the Federal Reserve Bank to work toward lower long term interest rates was adopted. And, legislation to repeal State "fair trade" laws—which permit minimum pricing by manufacturers and retailers—is being considered by the House Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member.

Furthermore, all efforts are being made to provide staff and funds to the Justice Department so it can prosecute all anti-trust violators more vigorously.

#### DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY

We witnessed an agonizing end to the agonizing war in Vietnam. I cannot escape the feeling that the war in South Vietnam was doomed from the start. I hope and pray that we have learned from this tragic experience, and will never again embark on a similar venture.

The end of the war brought thousands of Vietnamese refugees to our shores. These war victims have received our humanitarian aid with my full support both in the Judiciary Committee—which drafted the aid measure—and on the floor when it came before the full House.

The role of the United States in international politics is under vigorous review in the post-Vietnam, post-cold war era. In my view, we are facing a new world with a somewhat outdated foreign policy.

Of particular concern to me is America's role as arms supplier of the world. We are the world's foremost arms merchant—with some \$8 billion in 1974 sales—and provide hundreds of millions of dollars of weapons through grants in aid.

Much of this goes to unstable, war-prone regions of the world and to undemocratic governments. Continuation of this policy invites disaster, particularly because we so often supply both sides of a potential conflict.

Again, we should learn from experience. In the last decade, American arms supplied both sides of the war between India and Pakistan. Today, we sell sophisticated arms and weaponry to Iran and Israel, to Jordan and to Saudi Arabia, and to just about all the other nations in the powderkeg Middle East region.

In my opinion, the availability of U.S. arms makes military options more attractive to nations which would otherwise use diplomatic means to resolve their differences, and makes military rule and repression more likely in many countries.

With regard to our own military spending, many had hoped we could spend less for arms—and more on domestic needs—with the end of the Vietnam war. However, the argument prevailed in Congress that to skimp on our military budget on the heels of our departure from Southeast Asia would show a lack of national resolve to honor commitments to our allies.

Though the House voted for \$25 billion for new weaponry, I voted to cut that level substantially without impairing our defensive capabilities.

For example, I voted to continue the Trident submarine program but against the B-1 bomber program which has been plagued with cost overruns. I voted to make a 7 percent across-the-board cut in weapons procurement spending, but I voted against reducing troop levels overseas because of the uncertainty in Europe and Korea following the end of the debacle in Southeast Asia.

#### ENVIRONMENT

The most important environmental legislation of 1975, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act, was vetoed by President Ford. The House was unable to override his veto and prospects for a new bill to be passed in this Congress are dim.

I voted for the bill, and to override the veto. The legislation seemed to me a reasonable compromise which would have improved reclamation efforts by setting Federal standards for State strip mining programs.

Although it was alleged that the bill would have caused unemployment and hurt coal production, the data relied on to reach these much-publicized conclusions had "holes" in it. A careful examination of this data, and the presentation of more accurate data, yielded contrary conclusions.

The House will soon consider amendments to the Clean Air Act which may affect the standards for both stationary and mobile pollution sources. The President has proposed easing or suspending many pollution standards to conserve fuel. I will vote to ease these standards only if the evidence indicates that the public's health is not endangered. Even then, I do not believe that the delay in achieving the clean air goals should be as lengthy as suggested by President Ford.

#### IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

In early February, the Congress acted to prevent President Ford from increasing the cost of food stamps. While the

program is much in need of administrative reform, simply raising the price of the food stamps is not the right way to reform the program. All that does is make it harder on a lot of deserving people to have a proper diet.

As another step in cutting the budget, the President proposed "caps"—limits—on the automatic cost-of-living increases in social security and Federal retirement benefits.

Congress made these increases automatic a few years ago for a good reason: such increases protect these small incomes from being eroded by inflation. Although I think "caps" might be necessary as an emergency measure, I do not agree that—even in a fiscal emergency—the "caps" can be placed significantly below the cost-of-living increases. Otherwise we are penalizing those who are already hardest hit by inflation—the elderly on fixed incomes.

The House also approved amendments to the Older Americans Act to extend through 1979 the existing senior citizen programs and to add new counseling, housings, and transportation services for the elderly.

Many of our parents and grandparents require nursing home care. The Government's increasing contribution to this care—\$7.5 billion last year—has helped improve the quality of the Nation's nursing homes.

Still, an estimated half of these homes violate State or Federal standards. I support legislation to assure that the quality of this care is increased for every senior citizen.

National health insurance has been a recurrent topic in the past decade, and is of particular concern due to the rising cost of medical care. The Nation now spends more than \$100 billion every year for health, and some say a national plan would mean more health for the health care dollar.

But the reality is that differences of opinion on the type of national health plan, and an unwillingness to make large new Federal expenditures, make enactment of this legislation questionable in the near term.

Thus, I support a proposal to enact, in the absence of a comprehensive bill, catastrophic health coverage so that no American need face bankruptcy—or death for lack of proper treatment—in the event he is stricken by a dread disease or a serious accident.

The President vetoed legislation affecting Federal target prices for agricultural commodities, including milk, cotton, corn, wheat, and soybeans. I voted against this farm bill—and to sustain Mr. Ford's veto—because it would have increased Federal agriculture payments, raised food prices, supported some commodities already in oversupply, and halted the effort to bring free market competition to agriculture. In short, it would have hurt both farmer and consumer more than it would have helped the farmer.

#### GOOD GOVERNMENT

Efforts by the Congress to modernize itself and reform the executive branch have just begun.

Legislation to terminate certain na-



tional emergencies—and with them the extraordinary powers of the President in such a situation—has been reported by the Judiciary Committee to the full House.

The Judiciary Committee earlier reported two bills, both approved by the House, to reorganize the Federal prison parole system and to extend the Voting Rights Act and expand its protection to more minority groups.

In addition, there is considerable support for action to make public all conference committee meetings. Differences in House- and Senate-passed measures are ironed out in conference. The last-minute changes made there are important—often more important than actions taken on the House and Senate floors on the basic bill. In my judgment, conference decisions should be made in public, not in secret.

I have also cosponsored three bills designed to force open the doors of government. The Lobby Disclosure Act would tighten reporting requirements for lobbyists, bringing to the public's attention all spending for the purpose of affecting the fate of legislation.

I cosponsored a measure to require all Members of Congress to disclose full information on their earnings and assets. I have made such a disclosure since coming to the House in 1971. It is not required of me, but I feel that it is a way of providing a more complete picture of myself to my constituents.

While increasing numbers of Members are making voluntary disclosures of their finances, it will take too long for the disclosure habit to become sufficiently widespread. Therefore, I believe that a mandatory disclosure law is appropriate.

In addition, I have cosponsored the Truth in Government Act, which would make it a crime for Federal officials to lie to the people. It is already a crime for private citizens to lie to the Government on official matters. This legislation is needed at a time of declining credibility in official statements.

#### TO AMEND THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971

#### HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. BEARD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing an amendment to the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 that will require the Federal Election Commission to hold open meetings.

Last week, members of the Commission voted to hold their first meeting in closed session. With all the controversy now being raised about the secret activities of an agency like the CIA, it is inconceivable to me that the business of something as basic to our democracy as elections should have to be conducted behind closed doors.

I readily acknowledge that there may be some cases which would call for a closed meeting, and I am willing to ac-

cept amendments to my legislation that would not interfere with the public's right to accountability by the appointed members of the Commission. However, any amendments should make closed meetings the rare exception rather than the rule.

I am honored to represent a State that has a responsible and workable sunshine law, and I believe experience in Tennessee and in other States with similar laws has shown that the open meeting law has in no way impeded the conduct of public business.

#### JORDAN ARMS SALE—RECORD STATEMENT

#### HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposed \$350 million sale of anti-aircraft weaponry to Jordan would substantially tilt the balance of power in the Middle East to Israel's disadvantage.

The total of \$350 million, over 3 times the administration's own original proposal in May, represents \$87 million more than the total U.S. military assistance and credit sales to Jordan over the past 12 years. This enormous increase comes at a time when Jordan is moving closer to the other Arab States and has established a joint military command with Syria. This dangerous development flies in the face of the administration's argument that supplying air defense weapons to Jordan would reduce the possibility of such an outcome. In fact, the new Jordanian-Syrian alliance would hardly be possible if Jordan were not to receive such weapons. This equipment is highly mobile and cannot be said to be strictly defensive. It is particularly dangerous to furnish such massive weaponry to Jordan, since the Palestinian forces are continually attempting to gain political control in that country. The prospect of these weapons falling into the hands of the PLO should be sufficient to prompt congressional disapproval of this sale.

In addition, the Saudi Arabian funds needed to pay for these missiles draw Jordan even further into the ranks of those nations who seek confrontation, not conciliation, with Israel.

This immense weapons sale to Jordan was announced at a time when the administration had declared there would be no new arms sales to any Middle East nation pending a reassessment of its policy in that area of the world. The impartiality of this reassessment is thus called into question. The term "reassessment" would seem to mask a tilt toward a destabilizing policy destined to placate the oil-producing countries. Its real effect would be to undermine the cause of peace in the Middle East. I therefore urge your support for H. Con. Res. 337 disapproving the proposed sales to Jordan of the Hawk missile and Vulcan anti-aircraft systems.

#### NEW YORK'S FINANCIAL CRISIS: NOT JUST OURS

#### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, once again, New York City is embroiled in controversy. The financial problems of America's largest city have become the subject of nationwide concern. Despite the parochial observations made by representatives of the administration, New York is a vital factor in national and international economics, and its success and failure has reverberations felt throughout the world.

Yet, New York City continues to bear the brunt of cynical sentiments espoused by outside observers. This external hostility threatens to distort the city's image and obscure the compelling factors which make the city the only place to live for those of us who proudly call ourselves "New Yorkers."

It is with great pleasure that I include in the RECORD an article from the July 13 edition of the Washington Post, "In Defense of New York," which puts this question in its proper perspective:

IN DEFENSE OF NEW YORK  
(By Abraham S. Blumberg)

One of the myths most carefully nurtured across this nation maintains that New York City is not really part of America. This hallowed bit of conventional wisdom derives its sustenance from a conveniently distorted imagery in America's heartland which depicts this city as functioning at the moral level of Sodom and its physical profile as being akin to the hellish landscape of Gehenna. In substance, New York City is perceived as bereft of all amenity, perpetually plagued by racial and ethnic conflict, violent crime, economic crisis and environmental decay.

Coupled with this illusory model of our city is a fantasized conception of the "real" America that is proclaimed in terms of a fair continent lying west of the Hudson River. It is portrayed as a golden land of opportunity, economic plenty and social harmony—where the fruits of the earth, the means of life and life opportunities are on the whole accessible to anyone who will persevere. This romantic fiction is shared by the many who yearn for a rural utopia that has in reality never existed. They harbor a deep seated ambivalence toward urban life which is equated with sin, corruption, depravity, blight and disorder. Ironically, they simultaneously measure their own worth as human being in terms of their capacity to consume the material goods and services which only major urban centers can produce.

As a consequence, when New York City sought federal assistance to stave off imminent financial disaster, the rebuff was accompanied by ill concealed gloating over the city's plight, accompanied by ugly overtones of free-floating racial and ethnic hostility. Congressional comment supportive of the President's rejection of assistance, and public statements made by spokesmen for the financial community, appear to be best synthesized in terms of letting the fiscally improvident ethnics stew in their own juice. The politicians who have governed this city during the course of the past generation have no monopoly on mediocrity, incompetence and venality. They display the same quotient of these characteristics as is to be found in their counterparts elsewhere in the nation—no more and, perhaps, even less.

However, if New York City's political leaders have erred, or have frequently been motivated by cynical political considerations, on the whole they have done so on the side of humanity. They have at least attempted, albeit maladroitly, to translate the promises of the American Dream into substantive reality. The American Dream constitutes a pledge to override the iniquitous disabilities imposed by circumstances of social class, caste and estate which drove our ancestors to these shores. The American Dream is a commitment to overcome the contingencies of one's social condition at birth.

Historically, New York City has served this nation in its role as gateway, half-way house and foster parent to a mosaic of the poor, ambitious, rejected, entrepreneurial, defeated, gifted and deviant. In some regions of our country strangers are exhorted, "Visitors are welcome—but please don't stay!" We are a nation of arrivists, but on the whole are reluctant to share the dream with newcomers.

This city has attempted through the development of an unparalleled system of free higher education and health services to train and heal those who have been victimized by the long-range effects of slavery, ruthless technology and American imperial policy in the Caribbean. New York City has had to pay for and deliver those essential services that the Southeastern region and Puerto Rico, for example, were unwilling or unable to perform. If New Yorkers have been extravagant in the use of resources, the expenditures were for the nurturance of our fellow Americans, many of whom have migrated here in conformity with the traditional American freedom to pursue opportunity.

As the focus of a tri-state region, each day New York City receives millions of commuters who come to work, using our mass transit, sanitation, police, fire, health services and a host of other facilities, paying only a token amount of taxes to the city which provides their personal economic base. New York City is more than the mess-machine which serves as the nation's banking and financial center, port, book publisher, boutique, art gallery, salesroom, opera house, music hall, cinema festival, theater and general paper shuffler. This city's real wealth consists of the people who come here to market their skills and talents or to acquire them. In the course of this exchange process New York City cultivates and subsequently exports a good deal of its human riches to the rest of the nation.

It is rather unfortunate that, in the process of achieving a better life for so many, New York City has evolved a unique capacity to affect an impersonal, inhospitable, paranoid, rude, turbulent and arrogant style. It is mindlessly simplistic, however, to attribute our city's crisis solely to the conduct of predatory, greedy banks and financial institutions. Other equally avaricious sectors of American society—such as the military establishment, the automobile industry, the petroleum cartel and a variety of federal and state agencies—have also contributed to our present predicament.

New York City's problems are those of America writ large. Our fellow Americans will not escape our fate by securing themselves in exurban and suburban enclaves or floating us out to sea. The central problem of this city is ultimately also that of this nation: too many bidders for the ever decreasing resources of a finite planet.

It is America's cities which have produced the technology and capital that have been the foundations of American grandeur. Only when America meets the challenge of re-ordering our national priorities to effect a more equitable allocation of our wealth and resources in order to make a major com-

mitment to urgent domestic needs, only then will we begin to meet the dangerous problems confronting all our cities. Hopefully, as a nation we can thereby fulfill ourselves and attempt to come to terms with a less grandiose, but perhaps more constructive role in world affairs. Unless we revise our present course we are courting unprecedented violent social change which could culminate in a political disaster that will permanently alter the face of America.

VALENTYN MOROZ

### HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, the treatment of Soviet dissident Valentyn Moroz is a continuing source of shame to the U.S.S.R. and an affront to free people everywhere.

I have recently been informed by the Committee for the Defense of Valentyn Moroz that Moroz, a Ukrainian historian, has been transferred from Vladimir Prison, where he was serving a 14-year term for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda."

He is now in a special psychiatric hospital-prison in the city of Sychovka in the Smolensk region of the U.S.S.R. where he is receiving "treatment" consisting of injections of drugs and chemicals.

According to the committee, the excuse which has been given for the treatment is that no normal person could have survived a 145-day hunger strike, as Valentyn Moroz did last year in Vladimir Prison.

Mr. Speaker, this news should not be surprising. Others who have dared in the recent past to protest against the suppression of basic human rights in the Soviet Union have been treated in the same unspeakable fashion.

The Russians, not content with using force to prevent their citizens from speaking out, seek to control and alter their very minds of dissidents through subtle and sophisticated psychiatric methods.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the lesson we all should learn from the plight of Valentyn Moroz, imprisoned and subject to one of the most sadistic practices ever devised, without recourse except for friends in foreign countries far away, is clear.

Détente, while it may be a public relations man's dream, is still far from a reality today. Between ourselves and the Russians, there is still a vast gulf in attitude toward freedom and the rights of man.

Surely that gulf must be spanned before the trust necessary to any meaningful improvement in relations between our countries can have a foundation.

I add my voice to those of others in this country and around the world who are calling for the release of Valentyn Moroz, and for an end to this shameful, disgusting business.

### IMPROVED ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

### HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, in answer to questions asked of me by my colleagues as to the potential energy savings which inclusion of my amendment to title V, part B of H.R. 7014 would allow, I have assembled the following data. From this information, it is clear that we can realize substantial savings in energy by mandating improved energy efficiency in beverage containers.

Using Environmental Protection Agency projections for beverage consumption in 1980, we can estimate how much energy we can save at different levels of improved energy efficiency in beverage containers. The Commerce Committee estimates that the existing provisions of title V, part B, will provide savings in energy equivalent of 140,000 barrels of oil per day. This estimate assumes an improvement in energy efficiency of 25 percent. A chart—not reproduced in the RECORD—shows what similar savings for energy would be at different percentages of improved energy efficiency.

Clearly, encouragement of such savings would be more than worthwhile. With an efficiency improvement of 25 percent we could realize half the savings in beverage containers alone that we expect to receive from all the consumer items now in title V, part B. Actually, the EPA estimates that under certain circumstances, the aggregate energy efficiency of beverage containers, that is the amount of energy necessary to deliver the same amount of beverage could improve by 43 percent. You can imagine the savings we would realize in this event.

Part B of title V calls for an aggregate savings of 25 percent. Beverage containers as a group would easily achieve such savings through an applied effort of reuse, recycling and modification of design and composition. The following chart and graph will show how much recycling alone can contribute to that goal.

Current energy efficiency of various container types (according to EPA)

Energy in BTU (x10 <sup>6</sup> ) to deliver 1,000 gallons of beer:	
Refillable bottle.....	21.6
One-Way Glass.....	64.4
All Steel.....	38.8
Bimetallic.....	53.7
Aluminum.....	75.0

According to the provisions of title V, part B, the Secretary of Commerce would have to establish the standards for a particular class of beverage containers. In order to achieve a 25 percent improvement in energy efficiency with the current mix of various containers we would have to see an energy efficiency standard of approximately 42 BTU (x10<sup>6</sup>) per 1,000 gallons delivered.

The chart shows the feasibility of achieving a 25 percent energy efficiency improvement with beverage containers.



Remember that recycling is just one way to achieve energy savings. The all-steel can as well as the refillable bottle already exceed the Energy Efficiency Standard. With high levels of recycling both aluminum and the bimetallic container exceed the energy efficiency standard. Only one-way glass containers could not achieve the standard through recycling alone.

These savings are just through recycling. Imagine what savings could be attained through modification of design and composition. For example, the American Can Co. has estimated that its drawn-in-iron can will approach the energy efficiency of the 10-trip bottle if there is a 50-percent rate of recycling. Encouraging these kind of savings, which my amendment would do, will multiply the potential energy savings in the beverage container industry.

#### NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION— THE KEY TO CENTER CITY REVIVAL

**HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Steve Cappiello, of Hoboken, N.J., addressed the U.S. Conference of Mayors at their recent convention in Boston, calling for the establishment of a subcommittee post in the Department of HUD responsible for neighborhood preservation and urban revitalization. I wholeheartedly agree that HUD should pay more attention to urban revitalization and believe that Congress out to pay more attention to solving urban problems rather than creating legislation that works to exacerbate the destruction of our cities.

Mayor Cappiello, who has led the resurgence of Hoboken tells of that city's experience in this statement to the U.S. Conference of Mayors. I believe that his statement will be of interest and concern to my colleagues in the House. Mayor Cappiello's statement follows:

NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION—THE KEY TO  
CENTER CITY REVIVAL

(By Mayor Steve Cappiello)

The American central city is now engaged in a life-or-death struggle.

This condition stems from thirty years of neglect by an America obsessed with a suburban escape syndrome.

It was the suburban dweller who received FHA loans. It was the suburban dweller who was the principal beneficiary of billions spent on highway construction.

But now, we must bring this post war pattern into focus, and examine the world it created. The two hour commute. Anxiety and frustration.

And today, sociologists are quick to admit that the promised never-never land of the suburbs is not quite nirvana—nor will it ever be.

For thirty years this outward migration from the inner city diverted attention and money from the urban centers of this Nation.

And now we are paying for this neglect. Unfortunately, we have ignored our strongest asset in the central city—our human resources.

I speak from the Hoboken experience when I say that human beings, working with their hands, caring about their neighbors, about their neighborhoods, are the central cities' greatest resource.

Hoboken has this base. People imbued with the neighborhood ethic. People who care.

Our fish vendors know their customers. And the customers know their vendors. Neighbors know neighbors. And the cop pounding the beat knows his people. And the people know him.

It is this kind of human interaction that is helping Hoboken make the turn-around.

It is these people who are the true heroes of the seventies, who have scuffled and fought to maintain their dignity, their cherished lifestyle, their homes, and their neighborhoods.

It is these urban pioneers, preaching the work ethic, caring for their homes and neighborhoods, who deserve the incentives that were available to suburban dwellers.

It is these city dwellers who remained that provide the central city a viable base, a beginning for progress.

I think it just, that the government reward these people of the city with incentives.

Let's begin where the homeowner hurts most—his taxes.

Congress and the White House must amend existing Federal income tax legislation, allowing tax incentives for rehabilitation of owner-occupied housing.

Presently, tax breaks are given to a broad range of interests—from oil developers to persons developing a better breed of bull.

Now, we must demand legislation to help those with the greatest investment in the preservation of our central cities—the homeowner.

In Hoboken, our people are our strength. And, with Federal help and our own innovative planning, we have structured a home improvement program, which in three years has provided \$2 million in loans and grants to more than 250 homeowners.

It has proved successful, and it has stabilized neighborhoods, developed pride of ownership and a new community spirit.

These human resources, working with solid, progressive Federal funding programs, must take advantage of our great physical resources in the central cities.

We learned the hard way that urban renewal did not work. It caused havoc in the central city.

Now, we must target-in on existing housing and rehabilitation. It is working in Hoboken. And it can work elsewhere.

All of our central cities have solid housing stock—buildings which can be rehabilitated.

Neighborhood preservation is the key—if we are to revive America's inner cities. It is to our neighborhoods, and their people, that we must turn.

There are some who have undersold the neighborhood experience. They tend to forget the immigrant experience. They dismiss the value of the work ethic.

I have not. Neither have the people of Hoboken.

The neighborhoods of America must demand, and get, more assistance from the Federal Government. These neighborhoods, and their people, have been the forgotten majority too long.

We must fashion a strong national policy dealing with neighborhood preservation and the neighborhood experience. This is mandatory for urban revival.

Towards this end, I propose the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development establish a sub-cabinet post, an Assistant

Secretary for Neighborhood Preservation, to focus on the rehabilitation of this vital resource.

I propose that the U.S. Senate and Congress name special select committees on neighborhood preservation.

I also propose that HUD target one hundred pilot neighborhoods in America and develop a plan to upgrade them. They should be monitored carefully, and from this experience, a massive Federal effort must be made to revive the American Central City in a meaningful way.

This effort demands a working partnership on the Federal, State, and local level. And it demands the coalescing of the social, economic and political resources of this great Nation.

In this way, we can mesh our great human resources with our physical resources, and return our cities to their rightful place in contemporary life.

#### REACTION FROM AUSTRALIA TO THE NEW EMPHASIS ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN THE STRATEGY OF THE FORD ADMINISTRATION

**HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, it is distressing to read of the new fears which people throughout the world have when they hear of the frightening accent which Secretary Schlesinger and President Ford are placing on the use of nuclear weapons.

I reproduce here an editorial from the Sydney, Australian. It is entitled "America's Nuclear Option" and is reprinted in The Christian Science Monitor of July 17, 1975.

The editorial follows:

AMERICA'S NUCLEAR OPTION

Throwing aside the "massive retaliation" theories of the Eisenhower regime, and also the measured response theory which came in with the Kennedy regime, (Secretary of Defense Schlesinger) said that America would not forgo its right to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

To pacifists around the world this was an amazing statement . . . because it seemed to deny the principle which most peace-loving nations seek: that no nuclear nation will be first to use its nuclear potential. . . .

The statement must awe all second-world countries, of which we are one. . . .

There is no way that American troops will again fight a land war in Asia or, for that matter, anywhere else. And so the American Administration is reduced to its last card, the nuclear threat. . . .

Is this bluff by President Ford and Mr. Schlesinger? No, they mean it. They have no choice. The nuclear option is now the only one by which a humbled America can assert its right to a say in world affairs. . . .

Call it back to the wall, if you like, but the fact is that President Ford would use tactical and even strategic nuclear weapons in order to save, if that is possible, his country's credibility from slipping any farther than it has already. . . .

The lesson from all this is that Mr. Ford and Mr. Schlesinger are playing for keeps. It will be a reckless government in Russia, in North Korea, or elsewhere who dares to call the cards.—The Australian (Sydney)

## A QUESTION OF DISCRIMINATION

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, recently an editorial in the Ventura County Star-Free Press addressed itself to the subject of discrimination, which was prompted by a Letter to the Editor it received from Pat Jackson Rodriguez of Ventura, Calif.

Both the letter and the editorial are extremely thought-provoking, and I commend them to my colleagues:

[From the Star-Free Press, Tues., July 8, 1975]

## FAVORING THE MINORITY

Discrimination is a word of many meanings which has come to be used only to mean differential treatment accorded to persons of an alien race or religion.

Originally and until fairly recently, the differential for minorities was detrimental but lately, under coercion from governmental agencies, the differential has been preferential.

That has raised all kinds of problems—constitutional, legal, and practical—the most recent of which was created by the U.S. Supreme Court recently. In a unanimous opinion, the court ruled that employers found guilty of race or sex discrimination must normally give victims back pay for the time or promotions lost as a result of the discrimination.

Even before this ruling, some companies made large cash settlements with employees—generally women—who were paid less than men for the same work. That is a proper regard for equality of the sexes.

But discrimination can work both ways, as illustrated in the letter from Mrs. Pat Jackson Rodriguez that appears elsewhere on this page.

State, county and local government agencies are being repeatedly prodded by Washington bureaucrats to improve their Affirmative Action program or suffer the loss of federal grants and assistance for projects they desire. Private employers feel federal administrative pressure toward the same end. To improve their Affirmative Action stance means they must deliberately set out to hire more women, more blacks and other racial minorities, and, presumably, religious minorities, too, if their members complain about being left out.

The question is: Can any employer deliberately contrive to hire women or members of a racial minority for a specific job without discriminating against others who seek the work and qualify for it?

In its report on county affairs last week, the 1974-75 Grand Jury said "minority recruitment efforts are not yet satisfactory." This in contrast to the preceding grand jury which said the county was moving too far too fast in Affirmative Action.

Preferential discrimination may be necessary to redress the wrongs perpetrated against generations of minorities. But if it is, the guidelines for it ought to be clarified and made more consistent.

It makes no sense, for example, for one governmental agency to insist that no mention of sex be made in a job advertisement and then for another governmental agency to insist, for all practical purposes, that only women should be interviewed for the job.

Or what about this: Employers are pro-

hibited on the one hand from asking any job applicant his or her race or religion or even sex, presumably, at the same time the employer is being coerced into putting more women and members of minority races on the payroll.

And how can the government demand to know, as it does, how a firm's Affirmative Action program is going when there's no way to know the race or nationality of employees except by appearance or by the spelling of names—which means nothing?

The heart of the problem, of course, is that the U.S. Supreme Court has dodged the central issue, which is: Does discrimination in favor of minorities constitute discrimination against members of the majority? The court had a great opportunity to rule on that question a year or so ago in a University of Washington case involving admission of minority persons to the law school. Marco De Funis alleged that he was discriminated against when he was denied admission to the school in favor of black applicants.

The court declined to rule on the central issue because, it said, the point had been made moot by De Funis' having completed his law degree.

And so the issue never has been resolved. Until it is, what's to stop a white male, passed over in promotion in favor of a woman or a black, from demanding that his employer pay him back pay because of the discrimination against him? And how is Mrs. Rodriguez, the writer of today's poignant letter to the editor, to know what legal recourse—if any—is open to her to guarantee her right to a job?

## A CASE OF DISCRIMINATION

Editor, Star-Free Press:

A few words about equal employment opportunity.

Having a Spanish surname as a result of a former marriage has put me in a position to see job discrimination in reverse.

On Saturday, July 5, I received a card from the Oxnard branch of the State of California Employment Development Department. It stated there was a job opening, and for me to come in as soon as possible.

At 9 a.m. Monday, I was there. They called my name and showed me to a desk. I was told the job was with Northrop Corporation in Newbury Park. A very good job, with wages in line with what I have made in the past.

The girl proceeded to read off the qualifications. I had all of them. Then she came to a notation at the bottom of the job order. Immediately she discussed it with the woman at the next desk. She came back to me and said, "You are not a Mexican-American. We cannot send you on this. Northrop has to fill their minority quota."

I could not believe this. A state office where one would expect equal opportunity for all, practicing job discrimination.

Members of the majority, we are indeed being discriminated against.

PAT JACKSON RODRIGUEZ,  
Venture.

## HUMAN RIGHTS IN INDIA: A DOUBLE STANDARD

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the world is turning more and more into a

place of dictatorships and a place where liberty is on the retreat. India is the largest example of this retreat. Indira Gandhi who was always quick to criticize the United States has turned India into a dictatorship because of her fear of losing power after being found guilty of corruption.

Indira Gandhi and all those Indians who support her efforts have shown themselves to be hypocrites. They have criticized the United States numerous times for what they perceived to be U.S. transgressions but then they themselves resort to arrests and censorship to maintain their own power—something that has never happened in the United States.

American liberals have long found much to admire in India and have sung its praises even with or maybe because of that country's anti-Americanism. Few of India's American defenders have raised their voices in criticism against the Indian leaders' crimes against their people. Hearings are being held on human rights in South Korea and the Philippines. When are hearings going to be held on human rights in India?

## A MONTH OF INFAMY

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, the Turkish Government sent its armed forces into Cyprus for the ostensible purpose of protecting Turkish Cypriots. The move became a ploy that the Turks used to seize 40 percent of the island and, worse, create chaos, privation, hardship, and death for thousands of Cypriot nationals. No Greek Cypriot had ever experienced such a catastrophe.

Families were separated, the work of lifetimes destroyed, homes taken away; the bitter thoughts of the unconcern of an insensitive world has been the portion of these people.

Endless pleas for the Turkish Government to withdraw its forces and agree to a peaceful compromise have been in vain. The only action a foreign government has taken to reflect its condemnation of the Turkish invasion has been the decision of the U.S. Congress to embargo the shipment of arms to Turkey. It has done this knowing that it was from an American arsenal that the Turks drew their sword to smite Cyprus.

The United States, Mr. Speaker, does not wish to become a party to the quarrels of its allies, but at the same time it has a responsibility not to make weapons available callously for one of its partners to make war against another. To do so would be to label ourselves as international merchants of death.

I hope, therefore, that until such time as the Turkish Government is willing to seek a peaceful and humanitarian res-



olution of the Cyprus question, especially one which would permit the Greek Cypriots to return to their homes, our Republic will not place its own seal of approval on Turkish aggression by yielding to Turkish demands for additional arms.

The period of July 20 to August 20, 1974, was a month of infamy on Cyprus. Let us remember it was such in the days ahead.

# HOUSE FOREIGN POLICY HEARINGS OPEN

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege the other day to chair the opening session of hearings on our Nation's future foreign policy before my Subcommittee on Future Foreign Policy of the Committee on International Relations.

I want to thank today several Members who attended this important step in reestablishing the House as a strong voice in our Nation's foreign policy deliberations. I am particularly grateful to the chairman, our good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) for his thoughtful questioning of the first witness, Gov. Averell Harriman.

I also want to thank my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) who, though not a member of my subcommittee, stayed to help chair the hearing when I had to leave for a quorum call, and who himself contributed probing questions which helped illuminate the brilliant testimony of Dr. Hans Morgenthau.

Mrs. MEYNER, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. GILMAN also took time to ask many probing questions of both witnesses, as did Mr. BONKER, and I want to thank these Members of the full committee for their support and assistance.

Finally, but certainly not last, the regular members of the subcommittee, Mr. YATRON and Mr. GUYER, contributed their usual probing questions which helped all of us in placing on the record the invaluable insights and wisdom of two of our Nation's most thoughtful and experienced experts in foreign affairs.

The hearings will commence Tuesday the 22d at 3 p.m., with former Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and I would like to take this opportunity to invite all interested colleagues to attend this important session in 2172, and to participate in questioning one of the key decision-makers of the past 20 years.

On Wednesday the 23d, at 3 p.m., Gen. Maxwell Taylor and former White House adviser William Bundy will testify, followed on the 24th by Mr. George Ball and Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. On the 30th, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg will conclude the first round of hearings.

Mr. Speaker, the events of the past 20 years have shown us that we in this House must move to reestablish our constitutional role in the foreign policy process. We have learned the bitter lesson that neither the executive branch, nor even our colleague in the other body,

can serve as the repository of all wisdom when it comes to matters overseas.

The House, as the most direct expression of the will of the American people, has a rightful role in fully deliberating on our foreign policy and in advising our foreign policy decisionmaking apparatus beyond the bedrock of our strength—the power of the purse—and I hope that you will join with me in the coming weeks in continuing the process which began so auspiciously this week.

I now submit for the RECORD the statement of Governor Harriman with a note of thanks to this distinguished public servant. As this House well knows, Governor Harriman continues to serve this Nation in a public career which began under President Roosevelt, and which saw him administer the Marshall Plan for Europe under President Truman, represent Eisenhower at NATO, serve as a key policy adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and serve as our chief negotiator at the Paris Peace talks which concluded the American combat role in Vietnam.

And, of course, Governor Harriman served as President Roosevelt's Ambassador to the Soviet Union during World War II to culminate a personal relationship with Russia and her people which is unparalleled by that of any other American decisionmaker.

I would like to point out a key section of Governor Harriman's testimony Tuesday, in which he warns us that détente is a useful development only so long as we recognize that statements of cooperation and friendship must be accompanied by steps and agreements which genuinely serve the interests of the United States and the people of the Western World.

As Governor Harriman knows, we in the United States succeed when we are true to our principles of free expression and human rights, and we fail when we mistake mere business opportunity for substantive progress.

The articles follow:

STATEMENT OF HON. LESTER L. WOLFF, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON FUTURE FOREIGN POLICY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Today marks the opening hearing of the Future Foreign Policy subcommittee. We hope, with the help of distinguished witnesses, to explore the possible alternatives of a new and viable foreign policy.

An exploration is, by its very nature, meandering, complex, multi-faceted. As we take our first tentative steps, it might be wise to repeat or redefine the aims and objectives of U.S. foreign policy. We hope to solicit ideas which would combine meaningful design with flexibility so that we may avoid mindless drifting yet deal intelligently and purposefully with the unpredictable.

During the course of these hearings, we will attempt to outline the critical issues and areas of the future. Among them are the relations of the great powers and the alignments of the smaller nations. Within this scope, we shall try to determine what the United States interests are and where they lie. We will try to distinguish between the essential and the excessive.

By this exploration of the great future issues, we shall be better able to assess our political commitments and their consequent military obligations. By identifying our interests in their varying degrees of importance, we can more clearly appraise alternatives for foreign policies.

Our collective attempt to perceive the future political issues will necessitate a review or reperception of the United States relations with other countries. By recognizing fundamental relationships, we hope to uncover a genuine basis for negotiation and cooperation in the future.

There is an oft-quoted remark by the American philosopher, George Santayana to the effect that he who does not study history is condemned to repeat it. While I in no way wish to limit the scope or the depth of the statements to be offered by our distinguished witnesses, I do wish to emphasize that the scope of these hearings is the future. This will not be an inquest. From historical reflections on the whys and wherefores of past losses and victories, we hope to gain a measure of wisdom, or even insight. How well we have learned from history will be judged by how accurately we perceive and identify the great issues of the future.

Though we are starting with an overview, we hope in the course of prolonged hearings to study more specific areas. There are economic, scientific and technological developments which today appear just above the horizon but which might well within this decade totally transform the very nature of international relations. We shall be calling on the expertise of scholars, scientists and writers as well as present policy makers to help us understand these vastly complicated issues and to solicit from them a variety of ideas. We shall ask: "Where will we be in ten years and to what extent can the United States influence the course of future developments?" To all our distinguished witnesses, we offer open and public hearings.

STATEMENT BY W. AVERELL HARRIMAN BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FUTURE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: May I congratulate the initiative of the House Committee on International Relations on the appointment of this highly qualified Subcommittee to consider future United States foreign policy research and development, especially in the wake of the Vietnamese tragedy. I appreciate the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, which you have afforded me to appear before this Committee.

I want first to express the hope that the Committee will not be unduly influenced by emotions engendered over Vietnam. Loyal Americans have differed deeply in our past policies in Vietnam and for widely different reasons. Scars should be permitted to heal. I have been much impressed by opinions expressed to me by foreigners whom I respect that the manner in which we recover from Vietnam is of world wide importance.

It appears, therefore, appropriate to examine our position in the world today and to review our national interests. This is such a broad undertaking that I will limit myself in this statement principally to our relations with the Soviet Union as it appears clear that Soviet relations will be for some years to come our most absorbing concern. Then, too, I have dealt with the Soviet Government for nearly 50 years both as a private business man and a public official and have known personally many of the important leaders from Trotsky on.

I don't intend to bore you with an historical recital but rather to discuss the situation today; the opportunities and the difficulties; the possible and the improbable.

In May of 1945 in San Francisco at the meeting founding the United Nations, I told a group of publishers, editors, and columnists in an off-the-record talk that we had to understand that the Kremlin's objectives and our objectives were not capable of reconciliation. The Kremlin wanted a world of communist governments—dictatorships of the

proletariat—whereas we believed that man's interests and our own could best be served by governments responsive to the will of the people. However, I stated that we should do all in our power to settle our differences in situations around the world in order to avoid war on this small planet.

In other words, I believed then in "detente," the relaxation of tensions, wherever possible and still do. Unfortunately today, many people seem to give that French word a much too broad meaning, confusing it with another French word, "rapprochement." It is high time to say what we mean in plain English.

In the intervening years, although the situation has changed materially within the Soviet Union, I have maintained much the same views. It is interesting that at times I have been called a warmonger and at others, soft on communism.

I have continued to believe that there would be changes within the Soviet Union brought about largely by internal pressures from the demands of the 250,000,000 Soviet peoples of different races and backgrounds. The government, in my opinion, would be forced to relax its rigid controls and to give greater respect to human rights. Changes have taken place unhappily unevenly and far too slowly. In addition to internal pressures, statements and outraged reactions from abroad by concerned groups do have an influence as the Soviet Government pays some attention at least to world opinion. On the other hand, the influence of our government and other governments can usually be most effective if exercised privately and not by attempting to link publicly ideological with practical considerations in our negotiations. There is, of course, natural linkage between some types of trade and arms control.

I have visited Russia twice in the last 15 months. Last year I went as a private citizen but I did have the opportunity for a three hour talk with General Secretary Brezhnev as well as meetings with other Soviet officials and journalists.

This year, Mr. Chairman, you will recall President Ford appointed me to head a delegation to attend the ceremonies in Moscow commemorating the thirty years since VE Day.

The emphasis in these ceremonies was on the thirty years of peace that the tragic wartime and sacrifices had brought. In the Red Square, a youth demonstration was held—no victory parade of soldiers. At the ceremonies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses General Secretary Brezhnev's keynote address underlined peace as the primary objective. In his hour-long speech he, of course, paid tribute to the heroism of the Red Army and the long-suffering loyal support of the people. He also recognized the assistance of the United States and Britain in the War.

The speech was addressed largely to the Russian people. It emphasized the solidarity of the Socialist Bloc for peace and was critical at times of capitalist imperialism. Yet he expressed confidence that their call for "peaceful coexistence" was being "met with serious response in many capitalist countries." Referring to our own wartime collaboration, he spoke of our present negotiations for "cooperation in order to prevent another world disaster."

For this hearing today I would like to quote specifically from two paragraphs. In one, after referring to "the struggle for ending the arms race," he stated: "Meanwhile, this stockpiling of weapons, including mass destruction weapons, is becoming evermore absurd. The starting of a nuclear missile war would spell inevitable annihilation for the aggressor himself."

In the other paragraph I want to call to your attention, he stated: "The high-principled and constant Leninism support

of the liberation movement of the peoples—and the working class movement in all countries, invest our peace policy with even greater strength, influence, and popularity all over the world."

I am prompted to call these two paragraphs to your attention, Mr. Chairman, as they should be carefully considered in connection with our own policies. I believe, on the one hand, we are spending too much money on our new nuclear weapons systems, perhaps giving too little attention to our conventional military strength. On the other hand, we are neglecting the need to face Soviet support for so-called liberation movements.

The functions of the CIA are now under critical review. All abuses at home and abroad must be protected against in the future. However, the continued activity of this agency is of real importance to our security both in its intelligence activities and in its ability to help friendly peoples counter subversive activities against them.

I urge, Mr. Chairman, that this Subcommittee give appropriate consideration to these vital aspects of our foreign policy and national security.

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1975

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, during this week people throughout the Nation once again are observing Captive Nations Week.

Begun by an act of Congress in 1959, this week serves as a special reminder to all of us who cherish our freedom and democratic form of government that there are those behind the Iron Curtain who still yearn for the liberty that we sometimes take for granted. As Alexander Solzhenitsyn eloquently stated earlier this month:

Under the cast-iron shell of Communism—for twenty years in the Soviet Union and a shorter time in other Communist countries—there is occurring a liberation of the human spirit. New generations are growing up which are steadfast in their struggle with evil; which are not willing to accept unprincipled compromises; which prefer to lose everything—salary, conditions of existence and life itself—but are not willing to sacrifice conscience, not willing to make deals with evil. . . . Whenever you help the persons persecuted in the Soviet Union, you not only display magnanimity and nobility, you're defending not only them but yourselves as well. You're defending your own future.

We commemorate Captive Nations Week in the same spirit as voiced by Solzhenitsyn. Genuine and lasting peace requires a candid world. When we hear the argument that the protection of human rights is the responsibility of each government with respect to the people within its borders, we must reply that when government itself is the oppressor, we must look to the international community to seek redress. We need to reaffirm our commitment to the universally recognized rights of an individual to practice his culture, and to live in freedom and dignity.

#### SOME BALANCE IN DISCUSSING AFRICA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in most of the discussion that takes place on South Africa there is little balance. This is partially true in the case of Namibia or what is known by most people as South West Africa.

A propaganda campaign has been going on against the role that the Republic of South Africa plays in South West Africa. The administration of South West Africa was given to South Africa under a mandate from the League of Nations in 1920. Since that time South Africa has administered that territory which is about twice the size of California but is only inhabited by about 750,000 people.

James J. Kilpatrick in a recent column has put this issue in some perspective. At this point I include in the Record the text of his column entitled "African Decisionmaking" from the July 15, 1975, issue of the Washington Star News. The full text follows:

AFRICAN DECISIONMAKING

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Mr. William Johnston of New York, president of Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa, has delivered himself of a public letter once more denouncing South Africa for what he terms its "usurpation in Namibia." Because the letter is typical of a vast deal of nonsense written and published on this issue, it merits a few words of reply.

Mr. Johnston begins by identifying Namibia as "the international territory South Africa occupies in defiance of the lawful authority, the United Nations." South Africa, he says, must be made to "obey the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and the International Court of Justice." The gentleman speaks of "the Namibian people," whose watchword, he says, is "One Nation, One Namibia."

Now, Mr. Johnston's letter, recently published in the Washington Post, evidences no more ignorance and perhaps less hysteria than most such communications. It has become fashionable for Christian reformers, finding no problems worthy of their piety close at home, to exhaust their passions upon the sinful South Africans 5,000 miles away. Suppose we look at the record.

What we are talking about is South West Africa. The territory stretches for some 900 miles along the west coast of Africa, south of Angola; it is twice the size of California, and is inhabited by some 750,000 persons. To suggest that these people constitute one "Namibian people," having a watchword of "One Nation, One Namibia," is so gross a misstatement of fact that one is astonished to see it emerge from the pen of an Episcopal churchman. Fifteen percent of the people are white. Forty-five percent are Ovambos. The others are members of seven distinct tribal groups—Okavango, Herero, Caprivi, Bushmen, and others. The concept of nationhood, or "oneness," scarcely exists.

What about this business of "usurpation"? A more frivolous charge seldom has been leveled in international law. South Africa has usurped nothing. Sixty years ago this month, South African forces accepted the Germans' surrender of the territory. In 1920, by allied direction, South Africa began to



administer the area under a mandate from the League of Nations. The league went out of existence in 1946, six months after the United Nations came into being.

Over the last 30 years, a gauzy theory has gained credence that the United Nations somehow succeeded in law to the assets and functions of the league. It is not so. No chain of title exists. The U.N. General Assembly has no authority whatever to "terminate" the 1920 mandate. The assembly has simply assumed that authority or, if you please, usurped that authority.

The General Assembly, under the U.N. Charter, has no substantive powers. It can only advise and recommend. The U.N.'s trusteeship system might have some power over South West Africa if South Africa voluntarily had yielded its mandate, but South Africa has done no such thing.

Neither is South Africa under any duty to "obey the decisions" of the World Court. The court's 1971 declaration was an advisory opinion only, binding upon no one.

Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson once described the U.N.'s various resolutions as to South West Africa as a mere "charade." It was a kindly word. In his view, neither the General Assembly nor the Security Council had any lawful authority to rescind the mandate. Even if such authority could be inferred, it could not be exercised unilaterally. The late Mr. Acheson scoffed at the creation of "Namibia" as "an officious gesture without concrete effect."

South Africa has set in motion an orderly process for letting the people of South West Africa decide their own future. Later this year, delegates from all the major groups will meet at Windhoek. The government at Pretoria is committed to accepting whatever solution is there recommended. If this is "usurpation," the Episcopal churchmen will have to make the most of it.

#### WHY THE DELAY ON JAPAN?

#### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I have awaited some sign that the Ford administration is following up vigorously on the statement by Japan's top defense official, Michita Sakata that his country needs to play a greater role in the military security of the free world.

All that has come as yet is a mention in Time magazine that Defense Secretary Schlesinger may meet with Sakata next month. I emphasize the "may." In my judgment, this is not enough.

Sakata is a man of immense importance in Japan. He holds the title of director-general of the Japanese Defense Agency. As such, he is the top brass in the modest police-type military establishment that has been permitted Japan under the World War II peace terms.

Questioned about the danger of renewed warfare in Korea and its possible effect on Japan, Sakata had this to say, as reported by Time:

Security for Japan to now has been like sunshine and water. When there is plenty, people take it for granted. We want to enhance the credibility of our existing security arrangements, but Japan must be defended by the Japanese themselves.

The director-general had in mind, of course, the fact that his country has been on a military free ride since the big war and thus has been permitted to depend on us, including our "nuclear umbrella," without the cost of a single yen.

This has been the biggest of boons to Japan and, conversely, an enormous hardship for the United States which has spent billions over the last quarter century to secure the Far East, including Japan, to say nothing of the tragic sacrifice of American lives and casualties in Korea and Vietnam.

While we have carried the Oriental defense load, Japan has spent less than 1 percent of her gross national product on her military. Instead of forces commensurate to her weight in the world, Japan has gotten by with only 261,400 under arms—or some 40,000 fewer than we Americans have stationed in Western Europe alone.

This disparity in defense costs has been the single most significant factor in the Japanese postwar economic boom while our burdens in defending Japan and other of our so-called allies have been largely responsible for the economic difficulties we now face.

So the statement of Director-General Sakata ought, in my mind, to have been met with great enthusiasm here—his frank admission that Japan should have more to do in, at least, defending herself. And yet, his words appear to have caused little open stir either at the White House or the State Department. The Defense Department's reference to a possible coming meeting has been the lone publicized reaction.

And I ask, why? Why has this opening—this obvious "signal," as present-day diplomatic jargon terms such matters—been left dangling here? I feel it is of monumental importance and should have been pursued at once in the interests, certainly, of the cost-burdened American people. Why shouldn't we have jumped at the chance to transfer a part of our defense load to Japan? I know of no one these days who would oppose altering the old peace understandings to grant Japan the right to become a new military biggie in the Far East.

#### ENTITLEMENT EXEMPTION NEEDED

#### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, if we are really interested in creating a free market situation in our domestic petroleum industry, it is of the utmost importance that the small independent refiners be allowed to compete successfully with the major oil firms. The conference report on H.R. 4035 goes a long way in seeing that this is accomplished.

I am pleased that the conferees who worked on this report accepted the Sen-

ate amendment dealing with exemptions from the purchase of entitlements.

This proposal amends the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 to exempt refiners with a capacity of less than 100,000 barrels per day from the purchase of entitlements on the first 50,000 barrels refined on a daily basis. I strongly feel that this plan will help insure continued success on the part of many small refiners in competing against the major corporations.

Currently, the Federal Energy Administration rules on entitlement exemptions on a case by case basis. One small firm out in Carson, Calif., was recently denied exemptions by the FEA, and they estimate they will have to pay about \$2 million a month for entitlements. On a nationwide basis, about \$30 million a month is paid out by small refiners for entitlement purchases.

While it is true that these expenses are not passed on to the consumer directly, the long-range implications of the present situation do bear on consumer costs. Entitlement purchases represent a major expense on the part of these independent businesses, one that could have a very deleterious effect on their operations.

These small firms are vitally important in maintaining competition in our domestic oil market. We simply cannot afford to turn any segment of this market over to complete domination by the major oil companies, whose history of disregard for the public good has been well documented. Exempting a part of these small refiners' production from entitlement purchase is a positive step in seeing that free enterprise remains a fact, and not an empty theory, in the petroleum industry.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly recommend acceptance of the conference report on H.R. 4035.

MR. JAMES E. NISSEN

#### HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this distinguished body an individual whose outstanding contribution to the citizens and city of San Jose, Calif., deserves special recognition.

Mr. James E. Nissen began building and flying gliders in 1925 and started flying powered aircraft while in high school, after having received his private pilot's license at the age of 16. After a distinguished naval career, Mr. Nissen served as a research test pilot with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, a forerunner of NASA.

While an experimental test pilot for North American Aviation Co., Mr. Nissen leased 16.4 acres of farmland from the city of San Jose and formed a company which started operations as a private airport. In 1946 he began to devote all of his time to the operation of the airport. In November of 1948 the city of San Jose started development of the air-

port and Mr. Nissen was appointed airport manager, a position he has held with distinction until his retirement on August 1, 1975. He has guided the development of the San Jose Municipal Airport from its inception to a jet airport served by nine airlines and serving over 2 million passengers per year.

Mr. Nissen has made outstanding contributions to the city of San Jose and to the field of aviation through his service on a variety of distinguished committees including representation of the airport industry on the ad hoc committee of the Aeronautics and Space Engineering Board of the National Academy of Engineering and serving as the president of the Bay Area Aviation Committee and the California Association of Airport Executives.

During my term as mayor of San Jose, Mr. Nissen was a valuable asset to me personally and an outstanding public servant.

Therefore, I urge you to join me in commending Mr. Nissen on his personal and professional achievements and his diligent and devoted service to the citizens of San Jose.

#### AUDIT OF NURSING HOMES RECEIVING FEDERAL FUNDS

#### HON. EDWARD P. BEARD

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, a nursing home owner in Rhode Island says he is being reimbursed by medicaid for part of the cost of his Jaguar sedan. Another admits he includes his personal liquor bills along with food bills he submits to medicaid. In New York, dozens of nursing home owners have picked up food receipts from the floors of supermarkets and submitted them to medicaid for reimbursement.

In many States, there is no attempt to find out what really is done with all the money received by nursing home owners.

In Rhode Island, some \$90 million has been pumped into 150 nursing homes and in all that time, only 27 audits have been made and those go back only 1 year.

I am introducing a bill in the Congress that will call for Federal-State audits of all private, semiprivate, and public institutions receiving funds in the medicaid program. If you feel, as I do, that there must be a public accounting of all public moneys, I welcome your cosponsorship for this bill.

On June 26, 1975, it was revealed that one nursing home in Rhode Island overcharged medicaid by \$100,000. This is the situation with which we are dealing and I emphasize that these abuses of Federal funds are occurring not only in Rhode Island but in virtually every State in the Nation.

Recent investigations in Rhode Island have revealed shocking conditions in connection with medicaid funds and I am convinced that the program, as it stands

now, is a blank check for a financial bonanza for many nursing home operators who have not only cashed in on their nursing homes but, with medicaid funds, have been able to own and control the very businesses that service the nursing homes.

#### PROPOSED SALE OF IMPROVED HAWK MISSILE SYSTEM TO JORDAN SHOULD BE DISAPPROVED BY CONGRESS

#### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the privilege of testifying before the International Relations Subcommittee on International Political and Military Affairs chaired by the able gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) on the proposed sale of HAWK missiles and other air defense weapons systems to Jordan. On July 10, the administration informed Congress of its intention to sell Jordan a massive quantity of this sophisticated weaponry. Under an amendment to the Foreign Military Sales Act enacted in 1974, Congress has 20 days in which to disapprove the proposed sale by concurrent resolution. On July 14, Congressman JONATHAN BINGHAM and other members of the International Relations Committee filed such a resolution of disapproval in the House. Many other Members of the House, including myself, have subsequently joined in sponsoring that resolution. An identical resolution of disapproval has been introduced in the Senate by Senator CASE of New Jersey.

It is imperative, Mr. Speaker, that Congress exercise its statutory responsibility to review the implications of this proposed sale. I am confident that any such analysis will demonstrate conclusively that this sale would encourage the further stockpiling of destructive weapons by all nations in the Middle East and would increase the likelihood of a future Middle East war in which Jordan would join her Arab neighbors in seeking to annihilate Israel. This sale would be anything but the stabilizing influence which the administration asserts it would be.

Because of the importance of this issue and the likelihood that it will be before the House in the near future, I have inserted below testimony before the International Political and Military Affairs Subcommittee:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT F. DRINAN, BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before your Subcommittee concerning the proposed sale of air defense weapons to Jordan currently pending before Congress. The action which the House takes with regard to this proposed transaction will have an enormous impact, not only in shaping the future strategic balance in the Middle East, but also in determining whether or not Congress will in fact carry out its statutory responsibility to review proposed major arms sales and reject those

which are not in the best interests of the United States. H. Con. Res. 337, which I have co-sponsored, constitutes the first working test of the congressional disapproval mechanism added to the Foreign Military Sales Act by P. L. 93-559.

Yesterday, this subcommittee reviewed the specifics of the proposed sale and the sequence of events leading up to the transmittal of proposed letters of offer to Congress on July 10th. Several essential facts emerged from that investigation and corroborating documents.

First, the improved HAWK missile system, which makes up the bulk of this estimated \$350 million deal, is extremely sophisticated weaponry which is currently possessed by few if any nations outside of the NATO alliance. Second, the size of the proposed sale exceeds all prior military sales and grant aid to Jordan during the past 25 years. Third, the road-mobile HAWK system, along with the even more portable VULCAN and REDEYE systems, could be used effectively in an aggressive capacity if Jordan were to join other Arab nations in a three-pronged attack against Israel in a future Arab-Israeli war.

It is impossible to look objectively at the situation in the Middle East without recognizing the folly of providing these weapons to Jordan at this particular time. While Jordan claims to feel insecure surrounded by Arab neighbors armed to the teeth, it is apparent that Jordan's new weapons are intended to be used only against Israel. Certainly Jordan's neighbor, Saudi Arabia, which is paying for these missiles and cannons, does not expect them to be used against her. Jordan's neighbor, Syria, which agreed to the formation of a joint Syrian-Jordanian Military Commission following the announcement of this deal, clearly expects the weapons to be used to defend her against Israel in the event of another war. King Hussein admitted as much in a published interview last week when he stated that he would use the new American weapons to stop Israel from assaulting Syria on the Jordanian flank.

Historical analysis bears out the fact that the introduction of the HAWK system into Jordan increases the likelihood of another Middle East war with Jordan joining her allies in trying for the 5th time to obliterate Israel. In 1967, when Jordan fought against Israel, she suffered swift and devastating defeat as a result of superior Israeli air power. From that experience, King Hussein learned not to engage the Israeli Air Force again without an adequate air defense. Hussein has repeatedly cited Jordan's lack of a sophisticated air defense system as a key factor in his deciding to stay out of the October War in 1973. Now, with the United States agreeing to eliminate Jordan's chief impediment to engaging Israel in combat, Jordanian involvement in a future war becomes that much more likely. It is no coincidence that other Arab states, particularly super-militant Syria, have grown closer to Jordan following the announcement of this arms sale. The Arabs have become increasingly convinced that the only way to defeat Israel is with a 3-pronged attack involving Jordan. With the addition of the HAWK, the VULCAN, and the REDEYE Jordan becomes far more capable of fulfilling that projected role.

In the context of this overwhelming evidence I find Secretary Atherton's characterization of the proposed sale yesterday as "a stabilizing influence" in the Middle East to be totally absurd. Secretary Atherton described the HAWK-VULCAN-REDEYE air defense system as "modest indeed" and inferred that it would have less effect than a feather on the delicate strategic balance in the Middle East. The witness based his description on a comparison of the proposed Jordanian air defense system with the massive arsenals of the other nations in the region.



I submit that Secretary Atherton's analysis demonstrates precisely what is wrong with this country's present policy toward military sales. We have shipped so many weapons into countries throughout the world, especially the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, that a \$350 million missile system seems insignificant by comparison. If we sell this system to Jordan, there can be no doubt that Israel will come to the United States and request additional fighter planes to protect her national security against the deadly HAWK missiles. I suppose that Saudi Arabia, Iran, Kuwait, and all of our other customers in that volatile part of the world will then purchase still more American weapons to remain one step ahead of Jordan. Iraq and Egypt, who are supplied by the Soviet Union, will endeavor to enlarge their arsenals as well.

This is the kind of death-race psychology which has fueled the enormous growth of American weapons sales during the past five years. In FY '70, we sold less than \$1 billion worth of arms to foreign countries. By FY '73, the total had risen to \$3.8 billion. In FY '74, it jumped to \$8.2 billion. Last year, it climbed again to between \$9 and \$10 billion. An incredible 80 percent of these arms have gone to a handful of countries in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf.

The Administration has enunciated no policy toward arms sales yet the sales continue to mount. We are committed to the security of Israel, yet we provide arms to nations devoted to Israel's destruction. It seems that we will sell without hesitation to virtually any nation waving petrodollars in our direction.

Mr. Hamilton's Subcommittee on Investigations has held some useful oversight hearings on American arms sales in the Persian Gulf. I am hopeful that out of these hearings will emerge a recommendation for legislation to suspend all weapons sales in that volatile region until the Administration proposes and Congress approves a coherent statement of policy with regard to such sales and their impact upon the region. Senator Kennedy has introduced such legislation in the Senate and I have filed a similar bill (H.R. 4133) in the House.

As Mr. Rosenthal said yesterday, we are building the biggest powder keg in history in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf. It is time that this irresponsible practice was stopped. There may not be much time left to act.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

### HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I join with many of my colleagues in calling attention to the 17th observance of Captive Nations Week, July 13-19, 1975.

As the Bicentennial celebration of the United States begins, I think we would all do well to remind ourselves that many of the human rights which we take for granted are unknown in much of the world today.

The vigor with which continued expressions of protest and campaigns on behalf of dissidents are carried on by American citizens of East European heritage is clear evidence that they, at least, have not forgotten.

The fate of those dissidents—men such as Alexandr Solzhenitsyn, expelled from his native land; Leonid Plyushch, imprisoned; and Valentyn Moroz, subjected to chemical and drug "psychiatric" treatments—shows that the Russians have not forgotten either.

They know that the power of the freely written and spoken word is a power against which all the secret police and armies of the Communist empire cannot stand.

They know that for every Alexandr Solzhenitsyn, who stands his ground and will not be silenced, hundreds and even thousands of less courageous persons can be suppressed by the use of fear and intimidation.

They know that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty"—and so they wait patiently for us to grow less vigilant and less determined.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the real significance of this 17th observance of Captive Nations Week.

It is a week during which we should pause to remember the fate of those in Eastern Europe and elsewhere who have fallen under the domination of communism; to renew our determination to maintain the freedoms which we have inherited from our forefathers; and to lend our support to those in other lands who are fighting to win those same freedoms for themselves.

#### RAMSEY CLARK: SOMETIMES A CIVIL LIBERTARIAN

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in recent years Ramsey Clark has gained quite a reputation among some segments of our population as a spokesman for civil liberties. Of course, he also gained quite a reputation as a spokesman for the North Vietnamese and Vietcong cause in Southeast Asia.

What has not been widely reported on is then-Attorney General Ramsey Clark's efforts which established the first in a series of secret units in the Justice Department to deal with growing domestic disorder and violence. This was done in 1967 and has been discussed in the Rockefeller report on the CIA. Not only was Ramsey Clark organizing these efforts but one of his assistants was John Doar, who later turned up as counsel to the House Judiciary Committee in the Nixon impeachment proceedings.

Victor Lasky has written an interesting column on this with the details of Clark's efforts. At this point I include in the Record the full text of Mr. Lasky's article of June 19, 1975:

SAY IT STRAIGHT—RAMSEY AND THE CIA

(By Victor Lasky)

WASHINGTON.—Generally overlooked in the coverage of the Rockefeller report on the CIA was the startling finding that it was "the Justice Department under Attorney General Ramsey Clark which established the first in

a series of secret units designed to collate and evaluate information concerning the growing domestic disorder and violence" back in 1967.

The finding is startling because Clark hitherto was not known to have demonstrated any excessive zeal in going after radical extremists in his days as the nation's chief legal officer. In fact, Clark has always cultivated the image of having been excessively liberal. Ever since 1968, when he left Washington, Clark has been in the forefront of the movement to defend dissenters, violent or otherwise. Not only has he emerged as a leader of the American Civil Liberties Union, but he has devoted considerable time as a lawyer to representing extremists in trouble with the law. And, needless to say, he's now opposed to the sort of secret government activities which he himself promoted as attorney general.

Except that Ramsey Clark has never levelled with his adoring public on what kind of shady activities he engaged in as attorney general—that is "shady" in light of the post-Watergate morality. And also startling was the Rockefeller Commission's disclosure of who assisted Clark in getting the "goods" on "dissenters." Why, it was none other than that paragon of virtue, the Hon. John Doar, who made a name for himself as the "fearless" counsel to the House Judiciary Committee in its Nixon impeachment proceedings.

Among the charges levelled against Nixon by Doar was that the President had trampled on the civil liberties of antiwar people and other dissenters.

To quote from the Rockefeller report: "In early fall, 1967, Attorney General Clark asked John Doar, Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, to report on the Department's facilities for organizing information on individuals involved in civil disorders."

"On Sept. 27, 1967, Doar recommended establishment of a 'single intelligence unit to analyze the FBI information we receive about certain persons and groups who make the urban ghetto their base of operation.'"

"The FBI was to constitute only one source of information for the proposed unit. As additional sources, Doar suggested federal poverty programs, Labor Department programs, and neighborhood legal services. Doar recognized the 'sensitivity' of using such additional sources, but he nevertheless thought these sources would have access to relevant facts. Other sources of dissident information suggested by Doar included the intelligence unit of the Internal Revenue Service and perhaps the Post Office Department. The CIA was not among the proposed sources."

"Attorney General Clark, by memorandum dated November 9, 1967, approved Doar's recommendation. Clark found it 'imperative' that the Justice Department obtain 'the most comprehensive intelligence possible regarding organized or other purposeful stimulation of domestic dissension, civil disorders and riots.' He appointed a committee of four Assistant Attorneys General to make recommendations concerning the organization and functioning of the proposed unit. 'Planning and creation of the unit must be kept in strictest confidence,' Clark's memorandum stated."

"On December 6, 1967, the committee recommended in part that the new unit, in addition to analyzing FBI information, should develop contacts with other intelligence agencies, including the CIA, as possible sources of information. Following his committee's recommendation, Attorney General Clark on December 18, 1967, directed the organization of the Interdivision Information Unit 'IDIU' . . ."

"After its establishment, the IDIU commenced collecting, collating, and computerizing information on antiwar activists and other dissidents. The IDIU produced daily

and weekly reports on dissident occurrences and attempted to predict significant future dissident activities."

So we know that not all the Watergate-type stuff started with Nixon. Much of it was begun by those who later belittled the loudest about Watergate—namely, liberals like Ramsey Clark and John Doar.

#### AMERICA—IN 200 YEARS

### HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged recently to present Certificates of Merit to the winners of a high school essay contest, conducted by the Rockwood area Jaycees, on the topic, "America—In 200 Years."

The contest, open to high school students in the Flat Rock—Flat Rock High—and Gibraltar—Carlson High—school districts, attracted more than 500 entries. Each school conducted a screening to select their top 100, and a judging committee of teachers then narrowed the total entries down to about 50. From these, the Jaycees chose the top 10.

On June 28, I presented certificates to the winner, Mel Owen; the first runner-up, Jim White, both of Carlson High, and eight other winners, Robert MacGregor, Rich Grieves, Mike Przyzslak, Darrell Sawmiller, Bill Pittman, Ed Atweis, Marty Countegan, and Robert Panick. The two top winners had earlier received savings bonds as prizes, a \$50 bond for Mel Owen and a \$25 bond for Jim White.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Rockwood area Jaycees and the co-chairmen, Dan Kolhagen, and Michael Stiles, on this fine project which inspired such great interest among the students at Carlson and Flat Rock High Schools.

The subject matter of the contest was especially appropriate as our Nation moves toward its Bicentennial celebration.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD, a copy of the winning entry submitted by Mel Owen, and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

#### AMERICA—IN 200 YEARS

##### INTRODUCTION

America in the past 200 years, has been something we, all Americans, should be proud of.

Before 1776, Europeans, mostly English, came to what was known as the new world. When they immigrated, they were only looking for something better than what they previously knew. They unknowingly were the start of a great country, America.

In the year 1776, the people of the new world took a stand that shocked the rest of the world; they revolted. The Revolutionary War meant a free country, completely separate from any other, especially England, their "Mother Country." In this year our country, now so great, won its independence. The people of the new world became Americans.

Since the Revolutionary War our country has been involved in many other wars. The only one directly involving our country was the Civil War. The other wars were all fought elsewhere; the American people have stood proudly and strong, helping other countries in need.

During the first few years of our country's existence, there was much to be done. There was a government to be built and a frontier to explore. The original people of our country had much to do and did it with exceptional quality. What was hardest, was breaking away from the "Mother Country" and her customs, starting anew to build a different way of life.

Anonymous people are the people who made history. They gave their ideas for a constitution that proved to be in the best interest of all American people. It was thru these ideas, our "Forefathers" wrote a statement of laws and principles for governing a nation, the Constitution of the United States.

Government officials soon became adept in their jobs, no one asked questions as to what was happening. It was trust that laid the foundation for the country. Federalists were the first to govern this free honest nation. The government was strong. The United States soon became involved in world affairs.

About this time the country began to grow. The expansion southwest and west began. The War of 1812 helped open up vast new areas in what is now the midwest. Many battles were fought on the Great Lakes. The people needed a means of transportation and communication. Railroads, roads and canals were constructed.

In the 1820's the political parties' views and ideas became widespread. There were new representatives in government offices voicing the opinions and desires of the people.

Industry began to grow. Machines were invented to weave cloth and improve farming. Many other inventions followed, bringing the "Industrial Revolution."

Slavery became a large issue, the southerners wanting it to stay the same and the northerners wanted it abolished. This disagreement eventually caused the Civil War, with the north winning, and slavery was abolished.

The north rejected the south in ways of "Radical Reconstruction". The south needed help desperately. The only help offered was punishment for their secession. Eventually, the north gave in and the south was rebuilt.

Established areas were doing well. The north and south saw the potential for the westward expansion. The people moved west to homestead to land, to mine and ranch. New territories were established. Steel and oil became large industries. Railroads and towns were built, in this rough, wild, lawless territory.

America was advancing in world affairs. They bought islands in the Pacific and built the Panama Canal. Problems arose in European countries, World War I began. The United States helped their allies win the war.

When the war ended, business slowed down. Gradually, things improved and Americans lived well during the 1920s. Women won the right to vote, the development of radio, motion pictures that talked, automobiles being built, airplanes that flew non-stop across the Atlantic, were advancements that gave America better contact with the world.

A new crisis now faced the American people. The stock market crashed and the banks closed. The United States joined the world in a depression. Hunger was rampant. Unemployment ran to 25% of the work force. President Roosevelt started many public works programs which helped people survive.

Hitler's rise to power in Nazi Germany caused World War II. America came to the aid of the European countries. Shortly after the start of the war in Europe, Japan attacked Pearl Harbor, causing the United States to go to war in the Pacific. World War II ended, with the United States dropping the first atomic bombs over Hiroshima

and Nagasaki, Japan. Destruction was so great that Japan surrendered.

Shortly after World War II, communism as practiced in Russia and China, started to spread into Korea. The United States aided Korea, in stopping a communist take-over.

Alaska and Hawaii became important defense outposts of the United States. In 1959 both territories were granted statehood.

Russia created more problems. Missiles set up in Cuba were aimed at the United States. When this was discovered, President Kennedy issued an ultimatum to Russia; all ships must stop and turn around. The Russians went home.

President Kennedy gained much respect from the American people. When he was assassinated, the country suffered a tremendous loss.

President Johnson was sworn into office. He had many inherited problems facing him from his first day. One of those was the Vietnam War. Another was draft-age young men protesting. They felt the war was immoral.

Negroes started the Civil Rights movement. This caused racial problems to become widely known. Negroes believed they deserved better than they had. They felt things were not equal and they, too, were Americans. This major problem was unfinished business of the Civil War.

One of the best known leaders of the Civil Rights movement was Dr. Martin Luther King. This man's life ended tragically by assassination.

Drugs have become a serious problem in America. People are killed daily, either by murder, suicide, or accidental suicide. In medicine they are useful in saving lives.

Scientists have developed new techniques to treat almost every disease. There are more senior citizens and a lower birth rate than in our previous history. New discoveries are made daily, one of the latest was the discovery of oxygen on Jupiter.

America has become a troubled country. There has been government scandals. "Watergate" is almost over but its scars remain. Inflation is everywhere. Laws have been made to help the situation, yet price increases affect every citizen.

#### SUMMARY

America is a country with compassion, greatly respected by all nations. In 200 years it has been born, civilized, reconstructed, freed, expanded, allied, depressed, recessed, harassed and threatened. National leaders have been assassinated, maimed and scandalized.

At present, we are in a recession with hundreds of thousands of people not working. Once again we have a president with inherited national problems. We are America. After 200 years, our future growth lies within ourselves.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> "Mother Country" England, the country many of our customs came from.

<sup>2</sup> "Forefathers" Original settlers and law makers of our country.

<sup>3</sup> "Industrial Revolution" the way new industry changed the lives of the people.

<sup>4</sup> "Radical Reconstruction" The way the south was rebuilt by complete and rapid change.

"Watergate" Government scandal in the 1970's.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. MARTHA KEYS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mrs. KEYS. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, I missed the vote on the rule to consider



H.R. 7014, the Energy Conservation and Oil Policy Act of 1975. Had I been present, I would have voted for the adoption of the rule.

# EDUCATION AND THE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN WORLD DEVELOPMENT

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the Women's Equity Action League recently prepared a report on "Education and the Participation of Women in World Development." One section of the report addresses the problems of women in industrialized nations, such as the United States, in gaining equal educational opportunities.

In light of the continuing discussion about title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which prohibits sex discrimination in federally assisted education programs and activities, I would like to bring this article to the attention of my colleagues:

## EDUCATION AND THE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN WORLD DEVELOPMENT—A BRIEF SURVEY (By Kaity Miller and Micaela Mendelsohn)

### INDUSTRIALIZED COUNTRIES

In highly developed, industrialized societies, conditions of rapid and complex technological and social change have created the need for both broad general knowledge and specialized skills. If women are to participate fully in the development of their societies, and are to choose the fields where they can make their maximum contribution, it is essential that they have complete access to education and training in all areas.

It is fair to say that women in industrialized countries have benefited from a booming post-war expansion of educational opportunities. Recent studies indicate that the number of girls who drop out of school at the elementary level is lower than that of boys, and that girls are more likely than boys to complete secondary school. However, although women constitute roughly one-half of the post-secondary school population, their numbers in higher education are substantially lower than those of men.

Not only is there a significant disparity in the levels of educational attainment of men and women, but in the nature of their educational experience, as well. In many countries, marked differences exist in the curricula offered to each sex. An inquiry conducted in 1967 by the Federation of Swiss Women's Associations showed that at the elementary school level, in two-thirds of the twenty-two Swiss cantons, a difference existed in the number of class hours offered to boys and girls in basic subjects such as language, mathematics and science; at the secondary level, the hours of instruction in chemistry for boys and girls were the same in only nine cantons, and in physics in only five. Moreover, some educational systems still have sex-segregated classes, although the number is diminishing, particularly in physical education and 'life skills'; in the latter, home economics, sewing and cooking are reserved for girls, and industrial arts offered only to boys. This pattern is typical of the educational disparities that exist in many school systems around the world.

At the secondary school level, students in most countries begin to specialize in particular areas. Among European educational

systems providing general academic training, in which students specialize through course-line choices, there is a marked tendency for girls to enroll in courses emphasizing letters, arts, and languages; boys are more heavily concentrated in science and mathematics. Even in the more general education system typical in the United States, where specialization does not normally occur until later, enrollment of girls in science and mathematics, particularly in advanced courses, is below their proportion of the student population.

In vocational and technical schools, which are still separated by trade and sex in some countries, a similar pattern emerges. Girls constitute the majority of those taking home economics, health care and business and commercial courses; their presence in industrial, trade and technical courses—traditionally the preserve of males—is negligible.

In higher education, the sex differentiation in course choices is again striking. Women in universities are more heavily concentrated in the humanities, social sciences and education, and are poorly represented in science and mathematics. In other post-secondary schools, i.e. technical institutes and community colleges, women's choices tend to lie in health care, pre-school and lower school teaching, social welfare and in business and commercial fields, and seldom in technical or mechanical areas.

One explanation for the imbalance in the quantity and quality of education received by men and women undoubtedly relates to discrimination practiced by educational institutions themselves. In Switzerland, for example, as late as 1967, technical schools were closed to girls. Until recently, women in France were excluded from specialized lycées offering technical and vocational education, as well as from trade schools and the 'grandes écoles' which prepare students for high level jobs in government and industry. In spite of attempts in France and in other countries to encourage female enrollment in vocational and technical fields, the number of women who apply is still relatively low.

The persistence and universality of patterns of sex differentiation on various levels of the educational ladder, even where educational opportunities are equal, indicate that such differences may be due less to discriminatory barriers than to another more pervasive factor, viz. the influence of cultural conditioning. From early infancy, children are strongly affected by parental and societal expectations respecting behavior. Girls are generally encouraged to be more docile and dependent than boys. As they grow older, the internalization of these standards not only shapes their self-image, but gradually molds their thoughts and attitudes concerning their future roles toward those that are nurturing and supportive.

Formal education further reinforces the perceived differences in sex roles established in early childhood. Differences in course offerings and sex-segregated classes, as well as school textbooks which offer a limited range of female models (e.g., mother, homemaker, nurse, secretary) and underplay women's capabilities and achievements, all serve to perpetuate prejudices and shape self-images. Such differential treatment or 'marking'—combined with other pervasive forces in the environment such as public opinion, mass media, and advertising—subtly directs their interests and aspirations and strongly affects subsequent educational and occupational decisions.

By recognizing that schools can play a major role in counteracting the influence of sex bias on student attitudes and orientation, several countries have begun experimental programs which involve the re-examination and revision of textbooks, teaching materials, course content, teacher training

and vocational guidance and counseling. Sweden is a notable example, a country which is making a conscious effort in this direction. In Swedish comprehensive schools, all of which are coeducational, students receive identical instruction in all areas, including handicrafts, domestic science and child care. Among its goals, the Swedish National Board of Education lists the following: increasing students' awareness of sex stereotyping where it exists; informing them about the debate on sex roles; encouraging them to discuss and question existing conditions; and assisting them, through the guidance of special teachers and occupational advisers, in making a well-considered choice of profession. The enduring nature of sex-biased attitudes is demonstrated by the fact that, although surveys showed greater awareness of sex prejudice and sex-role stereotypes among Swedish students as a result of such teaching, there has been no dramatic change in their educational choices; Swedish males still predominate in technical and industrial fields, while women make up the majority in arts, nursing, and education.

In sum, when faced with the necessity of making educational choices, women are bound by socially conditioned ideas about their role, even when their options are equal to those of men. Since their preparation, both formal and informal, has not led them to anticipate a life-long career in the labor force, equal in importance to their primary role in the home, it is not difficult to understand why many women do not engage in a major way in advanced education or in training with a strong vocational emphasis. Even among those women who do embark upon 'dual' careers, the choice of training or profession may be dictated more by traditional considerations and less by personal occupational aptitude.

There is obviously a close relationship between the kinds of occupations men and women pursue and their educational and training patterns. Although women are employed in nearly all industrial and occupational sectors, most tend to work in white collar and service occupations, i.e. traditional women's jobs. Moreover, within various occupations men tend to advance to the managerial and supervisory positions, while women are often dead-ended in the lower status jobs. A similar pattern is apparent in the professions. Only a small proportion of women are found at the top in high status professional and administrative posts (decision-making positions). The English-speaking, German, and Scandinavian countries count only an infinitesimal number of women among their engineers. In Western Europe and the U.S., during the middle and late 1960's, the percentage of women in medicine ranged from 25% in Great Britain to 6% in the U.S.; in law, representation ranged from 19% in France to 3% in the U.S. Here too, discrimination exists within the professions themselves. In teaching, for example, participation by women is greatest at the bottom of the pyramid, in primary and secondary education, and is much lower in advanced education. In the U.S.S.R., and in other Eastern European countries which have systematically opened careers to women, statistics show that professional opportunities for women are significantly advanced. However, even in these countries, few women are found in decision-making positions, and professional women still find themselves burdened with the full responsibilities of home-making in addition to their career responsibilities.

In many industrialized societies there is growing recognition that the new occupational and general educational needs created by accelerated technological advances cannot be met solely through initial general schooling and vocational training. Therefore, various countries have reorganized

their educational systems to provide lifelong education on a recurring basis for adults wishing to complete or expand their general education, as well as for those hoping to improve their vocational qualifications or to acquire new ones. In many instances, such efforts have legislative backing: in France, through the Act of July 16, 1971; and in the United Kingdom, through the Industrial Training Act of 1964.

Programs provided by legislation of this type include public and private technical and vocational courses as well as courses in general education. Courses are also offered through television and radio, e.g., 'open universities'. Governments, private industry, and labor unions often institute manpower training programs which employees—both men and women—can attend during working hours without loss of pay or leave ('day release' courses also called educational leave). These programs give training in new skills and also furnish additional services, for example, child care facilities, job placement assistance, etc. Training costs are borne partially by the state, by employers, and in some cases by trade unions or professional organizations. Cost-sharing arrangements are worked out through statutory provisions, collective agreements, or by other means.

Continuing education programs have great potential value for women seeking first jobs, for those already employed who aspire to better-paying or different jobs, or whose jobs have been altered or become obsolete, and particularly for those who are re-entering the labor market. While women's participation in such programs is steadily increasing, their representation is still well below that of men. There are several possible reasons for this phenomenon. Adult vocational programs in most countries do not include instruction in and upgrading of basic knowledge and skills which women often lack, and which are prerequisite for further training; therefore, women's access to such training may be limited at the outset. Moreover, due to traditional attitudes and orientation, a legacy of earlier experience and training, many women are not motivated to take advantage of such programs. Finally many women choose not to invest time in these programs, since frequently they have no assurance that they will find jobs commensurate with their training when they are through.

If continuing education is to serve its purpose, it must be made more responsive to women's needs. In particular, it must be adapted to the special situation of women re-entering the labor market who still must cope with the demands of family responsibilities. Special arrangements such as part-time programs, flexible and convenient class schedules, limited course loads, increased child care facilities and more realistic job placement assistance should be considered. Several countries have already begun to incorporate some of these features in their national guidelines.

Although there is a great variety of occupational courses offered via training programs, the largest concentration of women is found in those areas leading to employment in jobs traditionally held by women, viz. education, health care and service occupations. Moreover, in all countries, women are in the minority in managerial and technical courses. The factors accounting for this phenomenon are undoubtedly similar to those which influenced the earlier educational decisions of women.

Clearly, even in highly developed countries, women's full participation in the economic and social development of society has not yet been achieved. Failure to create the conditions whereby women may avail themselves of the full range of educational and occupational possibilities represents not only

a deterrent to personal growth and fulfillment, but also leaves untapped vast reserves of human potential.

## PRESIDENT FORD ASSURES MIA FAMILIES

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the families of our missing in action—MIA's—are gathering in Washington this weekend for their annual meeting and conference to discuss the future actions they will be taking to promote a full accounting for their missing loved ones.

Yesterday, in a striking gesture of support and sympathy with the cause of our MIA's, President Ford traveled to the Pentagon Quality Inn to meet with the family members who had come to Washington. The President assured the MIA families of our Nation's continued determination to secure a full accounting for our MIA's—an issue too many have been too ready to forget.

Mr. Speaker, we are all too familiar with the tragic history of this issue: With the sad betrayal of the Paris Peace Accords calling for a free exchange of information about MIA's; with the confusion and anxiety caused by repeated unconfirmed reports of American servicemen in captivity in Asia; with the apparently unconcerned administrative attitude in the face of the diligent persistence of our MIA families.

Last fall I joined with this same group of MIA family members as we marched in front of the White House for several hours, waiting to meet with the President. Finally, we met with the President's aide, Gen. Brent Scowcroft, and asked him to recommend to the President the creation of a special task force to deal with this issue. Thereafter, I joined with my colleague from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) in sponsoring House Resolution 335, a resolution establishing a congressional panel of inquiry to sort out the facts and to work for a full accounting of our missing. I am pleased to say that this resolution has now attracted the support of 260 cosponsors in the House of Representatives.

Although that resolution has been bogged down in the Rules Committee for quite some time, I look forward to seeing it come to the House floor soon for a positive vote.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot simply brush the MIA question under the rug and forget the whole issue. There are too many unanswered questions: About the almost 1,000 men still listed as missing, about more than 1,000 unexamined crash sites which could yield crucial information, about some 49 grave sites we have yet to inspect, about 18 journalists who are missing in action, and several missionaries who have vanished in Southeast Asia. Admittedly, our leverage and bargaining position in Southeast Asia are sadly deteriorated. Yet, in a very real sense, our own involvement in Southeast

Asia cannot truly be ended until we have closed the book on the sad and tragic story of our MIA's.

The President will be meeting with a delegation of the officials of the National League of Families on next Tuesday, in a meeting which I hope will be fruitful and productive. His remarks to the families yesterday were brief, but pointed, in that they helped to reassure our MIA families that the fate of their loved ones is still a high priority in this country, and that this country is determined to account for them and to continue its vigorous actions in this direction.

I respectfully ask that the President's remarks to our MIA families be reprinted in this portion of the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to join with us in cosponsoring House Resolution 335, creating a Congressional Select Committee on MIA's.

The remarks follows:

## PRESIDENT FORD'S COMMENTS TO POW/MIA FAMILIES

Congressman Gilman and all of you who I know have such a deep concern and personal interest in a matter that concerns me as well as your fellow Americans. I welcome you to Washington and I'm honored and pleased to have the opportunity of meeting with you just for a few minutes. I am meeting with a group from your organization next Tuesday afternoon and I look forward at that time to talking in depth with your representatives as to what we can do. Despite overwhelming odds against us, I can assure you that your Government will maximize its effort despite the serious problems that we have. I know there is a proposal, there may be more than one in the Congress, to set up a commission or a committee. We have been working with people from your organization. I have nothing but the greatest admiration and affection for you and we in the White House will do everything that we possibly can to get what information . . . to make sure and certain that in good conscience you can believe that your Government has done for you what is right and we'll make sure of that.

## RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AND EDUCATION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, freedom of religion has always been one of the most precious rights in America. Men and women can exercise their religious beliefs as they choose and bring their children up according to these beliefs.

Consequently I was very disturbed by an article by nationally syndicated columnist James J. Kilpatrick. It seems that part of the parental right is being called into question in Ohio. Several members of a fundamentalist group—the Dunkards—have been convicted of a criminal offense, that of sending their children to a school established by the congregation which does not conform to the minimum standards for Ohio elementary schools.

As Mr. Kilpatrick says, many of the standards make little sense to a small,



religiously oriented school. Why, for example, should the school be required to maintain a costly "remedial reading laboratory appropriately equipped" or retain the services "of a certified person responsible for a multimedia program?" If Ohio succeeds in enforcing such rules the net effect will almost certainly be the closing of the school and an infringement of liberty.

The conviction of the members of this religious group was wrong and should be reversed. The State has gone too far in intermeddling in the private affairs of its citizens.

Following is the text of James J. Kilpatrick's article:

OHIO THREATENS RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN  
SCHOOL CASE

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

DAYTON, OHIO.—What rights do parents have in the education of their children? What power does the State have to impose its collective will upon them? A case is now working its way through the Ohio courts in which these questions are presented, starkly and brutally, for timely review.

The case involves 15 parents in Greenville, a small town 40 miles northwest of Dayton. The parents are what are known, religiously, as fundamentalists. Several are members of the Old German Baptist Brethren, the Dunkards. They have now been indicted, brought to trial, found guilty, fined and put under injunction for this criminal offense. They have sent their children to the Tabernacle Christian School, which does not conform to the Minimum Standards for Ohio Elementary Schools.

It is incredible that any such criminal case could have been prosecuted in a nation that guarantees to every person the free exercise of religion. Yet the convictions of these parents are now on record. If they lose their appeal, they lose their school. The State of Ohio, in its wisdom, will have squashed their religious liberty as coldly, and as indifferently, as a bartender swats a fly on his counter.

What goes on here? The parents in this case are unconventional people. They do not conform. Says the Rev. Levi W. Whisner, principal of the school and pastor of the Tabernacle Christian Church: "We live lives of separation from the world. We don't engage in drinking or card-playing. We enforce standards of modesty, sobriety, humility, prayerfulness and separation from the world."

The small congregation established its school to promote these religious convictions. Its teachers must be "born again" Christians. Its teaching is geared closely to the Bible. Pupils also are instructed in English, spelling, arithmetic, science, social studies, art, music, physical education, reading, American history, and Ohio history. At the parents' trial in May of last year, it was uncontested that the pupils excelled on standard national tests.

The evidence indicated that the school meets other reasonable requirements. It has a six-hour school day, and a 180-day term. It reports daily attendance to the Greenville school superintendent. It has not offended against requirements as to sanitation, fire hazards and safety.

What, then, is the problem? The state, in its majesty, asserts that the Tabernacle Christian School has not conformed to all of the minimum standards of the Ohio regulations. There are roughly 600 such standards. They range from the trivial—drinking fountains must have a "slanted stream"—to the costly: A school must maintain a "remedial reading laboratory appropriately equipped." It must retain the services "of a certified person responsible for a multimedia program."

Of greater concern to these God-fearing parents, the Ohio standards, on their face,

appear to require a school "philosophy" acceptable to state authorities. The minimum standards require that "all activities shall conform to policies adopted by the board of education." Another minimum standard says that each elementary school must participate in "school-community" activities.

Some of the standards doubtless make sense. As applied to a small, religiously oriented school, most of them are nonsense. Worse than nonsense. The case of these 15 parents provides dismaying evidence of how far we have retreated in the past 200 years from the principles and convictions that gave our country birth.

The State of Ohio's only valid, defensible interests in these children are (1) that they be sufficiently educated so that they will be no burden upon society, and (2) that they be protected from serious hazards to their safety. Beyond these points, the state has no interest. It has only an obligation—to protect the right of a free people to live freely, damaging no one, exercising their religion as they choose, rearing their children according to their own godly precepts.

Well, we have courts—appellate courts—with a duty to curb the arrogance of the flyswatting state. If Ohio's courts let these outrageous convictions stand, the Supreme Court must be asked to lay down the law.

OUR FLAG

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I received a copy of a very moving and inspirational tribute to our American flag.

The tribute was written by Mrs. Myrtle Cress—a retired school teacher, mother of eight, and winner of a Freedom Foundation Award, who will celebrate her 85th birthday this month. Our former colleague, Ed Edmondson, shared this essay with me. I was deeply touched by Mrs. Cress' words, and I would like to take this opportunity to share her tribute with all of my colleagues in Congress:

THE FLAG—I ANSWER WHY?

(By Myrtle Cress)

The most beautiful picture in the world is not in any gallery. You can see it in just one place and then only in June. On the old highway that links Manhattan and Abilene, Kansas, is the one spot that until a few years ago was the exact center of United States. The late rains of May have washed the grass clean and the flint hill soil has given it a particularly vivid shade of green. Not a speck of dust dulls the blue of the sky.

You top a low hill and there it is, off to your right—a low concrete base and above it, waving in the gentle breeze—The Flag, against the blue sky—the only man-made thing in sight.

You know that off to the left and beyond the hill is Ft. Riley and that on the slope of another are "white crosses, row on row" but unless an M.P. comes along and tells you that you may not stop, you are held by the sheer beauty of the scene and the inspiration of that one man-made object against a background that only GOD can paint.

I saw it many times in the years just after World War II, some-times an eagle flying over seemed to be on guard and once when "Taps" sounding, marked the end of day.

Perhaps our flag has some special meaning for me, because my most impressionable years of intense Patriotism and Memorial Day meant something, instead of the roar of auto-races.

Those were days when soldiers of the War Between the States marched to the music of fife and drums in a parade to the Cemetery; their wives in white dresses rode in carriages, then planted flags on all of their soldier-graves; then on to the River bridge where flowers were scattered on the water in memory of the Sailors and Marines.

School girls in white dresses and boys in Sunday clothes marched as Honor Guard for the parade and after were exposed to Orations, a picnic dinner in the Park and all of the ice cream we could eat.

There was always Fourth of July, when the parade led to the Fairgrounds with dinners (family picnic style), then horse races and games and a very few fireworks finished the day.

Almost before I knew it, came World War I and blisters on my fingers from awkward knitting needles while the pile of khaki colored sweaters grew higher. Another World War later found me wearing a five star service-pin in my school, where the flag flew at half-mast for the boys and girls who would not return.

Ten more years, then retirement found me in California—yes, in a schoolroom, in the middle of a situation that I never would have thought could happen in this country.

At least once in every lifetime comes a time when we must speak our convictions or ever after avoid our mirrors. For me, it came as I watched the Voice of Youth program on the Santa Barbara Station.

A most attractive student was speaking: "The main concern of my group," he said, "is, why salute the flag, which is only a piece of colored cloth, or why pledge allegiance to a government for which we have no respect. If we must, why not also say, 'Heil Hitler', and if not, then tell us why."

His sincerity was evident; he wasn't just being smart.

The announcer was equally sincere, "I can't give you an answer on the spur of the moment," he said; "your respectful presentation of the Case for Youth needs as sincere an answer, one that you can accept. Maybe some of the viewers has one for all of us."

I did try and for a week my letter was read each evening on that Program. Really, all that I said was what I had lived and taught in all of my classes. Something like this:

It was 200 years since the Colonists had brought to the New World a different way of life. For New England it meant a home and Freedom to worship God; for New York, it meant Freedom to trade and to establish a Patron System; for Virginia, it was the Freedom to have great plantations, also for the Carolinas—and for Georgia it opened the doors of Debtors prisons and gave a new chance in life. For all it meant the four freedoms that we claimed as our Ideals until a few years ago, when we added a Fifth.

Many people had even become quite rich and for them contact with the parent country was still close; their great grandchildren, however, grew up thinking and acting more freely. When the young men went overseas to finish their education, or the sons of the poorer people worked on the slow sailing ships that carried raw materials from the Colonies to the Old World and brought the manufactured goods back to be sold here, they saw the unfairness.

Long days on ships, with nothing to stop their vision and little to interrupt their thinking, gave them time to analyze all of this and to turn thinking into feelings.

"It just isn't fair" was the conclusion. And so the Revolution was born and finally won.

"Now we must find a way to hold the people together," they said. "We must not lose to anarchy what has been so dearly achieved," they told each other; "we must find a way to save the best of the last 200

years and build a future that will last who knows how long," they said.

"A Constitution? Surely; but we know that not many people can read—few men and fewer women, it will take more than words on paper to hold us together."

"A banner will help, if we can make one that means all of us and our ideas and intentions."

Those Sons of the Revolution had never heard of "psychology" but they were using it like professionals. They knew that thoughts become feelings and that color is the spark that starts feelings into actions.

"We must use Nature's colors for we are children of Nature; we understand her language; we must give the colors meanings that the people will accept and they must be able to inspire us to live the Ideals that we have sacrificed and fought for."

"The highest color that we can see? In a clear blue of the sky, of course, and it must represent the highest active part of us—our brains; we will put a field of blue in the highest part of our flag and in that field we will put white stars, one star to represent each state; the white will mean purity of ideals and purposes. White stripes will have the same meaning and red ones for the courage with which we fought for those Ideals and convictions. We must now work to build a Nation, the like of which the world has never seen!"

So, we salute—not a piece of colored cloth, but the Ideals and Courage of a people who lived and died for them and of us, who may now live these same Hopes and Ideals that has helped our Nation to become the Leader among Nations, that it now is.

To the FOUR FREEDOMS that punctuated the struggles of 200 years of Colonial history and also, the 200 years of history of our States we now add a fifth—FREEDOM from poverty, which we hope we may win soon; over all Five then may be a canopy of PEACE under GOD for all to share in this—the one nation where the ideal of Democracy and Freedom has endured so long.

All of this, our colors mean to me. With pride, I salute the Flag of my Country.

#### WEAK MESSAGE

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, that crime in America is a problem is no stunning revelation. We are all very aware of the statistics, which reflect our rising crime rate. Everyday we can read about another body found in the District, and the stories of terrorized American citizens are almost commonplace. Yet, we in Government—public service—seem unable, or unwilling, to respond with positive action or even ethos.

Where is our sense of outrage that parts of our cities have been given up to criminals? Where is our indignation that the citizens of the United States cannot feel safe walking about their Capital at night? Where is our anger that many Americans feel besieged in their homes? But most of all, where is our sense of responsibility? How long will it be until we in Government provide the leadership needed to curb the rising crime rate?

When I heard that Mr. Ford was going to speak about crime, to the Nation, I was pleased, for I thought that perhaps there was going to be leadership in solv-

ing the problem. I thought that after too many years of emotional "law and order" speeches, our President was going to provide enlightened reasoned analysis. I was mistaken.

Rather than provide a reasoned analysis, President Ford gave us the lines about mandatory jail sentences—lines, with which the leading criminologists, including Dr. Donald Cressay, of the University of California at Santa Barbara, disagree. Instead of providing dispassionate suggestions, President Ford gave us the old law and order rhetoric cosmetically altered so as to make it more acceptable for television.

President Ford failed to mention two of the most basic causes for the rising crime rate. First, he refused to address the problems of guns in America. He inconsistently urges the Congress to ban the domestic manufacture of small handguns, including the all too well known Saturday night special, but refuses to oppose their possession or support their registration. How long will it take the Government to get over its "Wild West" mentality, in which men are tough, and the gun is the sign of masculinity?

Second, in his disappointing speech, Mr. Ford made no reference to white collar crime. We cannot hope to end crime in the street until we end crime in the suite. Today in America, there are former political and business leaders, who are self admitted criminals, and yet, because of their position, walk the streets. Rather than speaking of mandatory jail sentences for these criminals, however, Mr. Ford prefers to speak, as he did last September, of mercy and compassion. Possibly President Ford believes that there is only so much compassion and mercy, and it should be dispensed from the top down. Perhaps this is another version of the trickle down theory which pervades this administration.

I do not doubt the political practicality of such a policy, but I question its morality. Why should the man on East Capitol go to jail, and the man on Pennsylvania Avenue go free? Why should the man in the ghetto or barrio who steals \$79 languish in prison and the man who bilks the United States of tens of thousands of dollars have his movement unencumbered?

Mr. Ford's actions and his speech provide more evidence, although no more is needed, that in America we have one law for the rich and powerful, and another for the poor and weak.

Mr. Ford fails to realize that the crime rate will only go down when the common person believes that the jurisdiction of the law is being meted evenly to the poor and the rich; the weak and the powerful; the black and the white. Mr. Ford does not realize that the low- and middle-class person is going to come to accept crime as a profitable, acceptable mode of behavior, which can advance one up the social, political, and financial ladder, if powerful people are allowed to continue to break the law and then go free to play golf with their cronies.

I suggest to Mr. Ford, and all of those who support his position, that they spend less time urging the creation of more

stringent laws, and more time creating trust: Less time arguing for the dispensing of mandatory jail sentences, and more time dispensing concern for the background situations which are at the root of our crime problem. Only then will we all be on the way to finding a solution.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce this editorial from the Woodland-Davis Daily Democrat which expresses similar displeasure and disappointment about President Ford's recent crime speech:

#### AS WE SEE IT—WEAK MESSAGE

Crime is a proper topic for a president to address, even though crimes which worry people most—rape, muggings, burglary, murder—usually fall outside federal law enforcement jurisdictions. Thus, much of Richard Nixon's "law and order" talk was to win votes, not curb wrongdoing.

Yet, a courageous White House can promote "domestic tranquility," a term used often in President Ford's message to Congress on crime. That Mr. Ford, too, dodged courageous proposals and wooed votes indicates the weakness, and danger, in his message.

It makes no sense for the President to urge Congress to ban the domestic manufacture, assembly or sale of cheap handguns known as "Saturday Night Specials," but not oppose possession of them or suggest handgun registration. Required registration would help keep such weapons from those who use them most—criminals.

It makes no sense to call for new mandatory jail terms when experience shows that is a tactic more likely to overcrowd jails even further than to reduce crime.

It makes no sense to claim that "for too long, the law has centered its attention more on the rights of the criminal than on the victim of the crime," as Mr. Ford did, when that is a distortion of intent. The attention the law pays to such rights is aimed at protecting all people—everyone—from abuses by the state. Power corrupts, including, in some places, police power. With that knowledge instilled in them by experience, the Founding Fathers provided the Bill of Rights. Its protections, however, have been eroded, a fact which requires the law's attention to such rights.

Instead of inflaming the passions of those who think only superficially about crime, Mr. Ford could have served the country better by high-level, white-collar crime which cause speaking more of ways to end the kinds of broad disrespect for law and which tend to encourage the kinds of crime that show up in the official statistics.

He could have called for a new national assault on the conditions that breed crime, for national "government in the sunshine" so that people can see officials serving the general—not the special—interest, for a voluntary reduction of the glorification of violence in films and on television, and for an array of other positive anti-crime steps.

Crime is a problem in the United States; however, bigger police forces and bigger jails have done little so far to reduce it. New idea and new attitudes are needed to help individuals understand their responsibility not to commit unsocial acts against others. Pressures can force even the well-educated and financially well-to-do into criminal acts—as many caught in Watergate's web confessed. Pressures on the poorly educated and the desperate are far greater.

The president's message contained some positive aspects, particularly his call for aid to the victims of crimes. But its dominant tone and principal proposals were sadly distorted by political concerns. The country has heard all that before; it needed no more, especially from President Ford.



# CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK HAS SIGNIFICANCE FOR ALL AMERICANS

## HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is my profound honor to join with my colleagues in Congress in observing the 17th annual commemoration of Captive Nations Week. It is on this occasion that we pledge our support to the struggle for freedom for all captive people and this year the occasion is especially significant not only because of the dramatic losses in individual freedoms recorded this past year, but also because of the real threat which communism poses to the future security of the free world community.

This past year with the fall of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, the number of captive nations swelled to 29, and millions more men, women and children were made new slaves to the bondages of communism. Yet there are no assurances that Communist advances will end with these gains. Already Portugal is on the verge of communism, Italy in her recent elections saw dramatic gains made by her Communist Party. In addition, people living in Nationalist China and South Korea are on a constant vigil against what they consider to be imminent threats from their Communist neighbors.

The Soviet Union remains one of the main controllers of captive people in the world. It would be fitting on this occasion for the United States to begin to seriously reevaluate the viability of our present détente with the Soviets. The fundamental question we must ask is: Can we accept détente, knowing that it does extend any hope of freedom for the captive people of the world, many of whom have placed great faith in détente as their vehicle to regain freedom. Can détente have credence when it has already been characterized by many in this Nation as a largely concessionary policy with respect to the United States. Finally can we ignore the fact that while the Soviets are professing support for a new policy of international cooperation with the West, their actions seem to indicate a new effort to build tensions between our two nations.

Détente must be contingent on the Soviet Union granting self-determination to the more than 35 million persons under their control. We in our capacity must make this a prerequisite for any major agreement in the future. Détente in theory is commendable but it must be just as feasible in practice if it is to work.

We in the United States are approaching our Bicentennial celebration marking the 200th anniversary of our ending our own period as a captive nation. The fundamental beliefs which led us to draw up our own Declaration of Independence remains valid today and for many others in the world is considered the bible of freedom. As we work to reaffirm our own freedom as a nation let us also work to protect our allies and work to restore basic liberties for cap-

tive nations. We must do this to strengthen our position as the leader of the free world and it will also demonstrate our active commitment to preserving and extending freedom both at home and wherever its roots want to grow.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert an excerpt from an article written in the Ukrainian Journal by Dr. Leo Dobriansky, Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee. This portion of his article deals with his assessment on what détente should be. Dr. Dobriansky has provided us with excellent insights in the past and I urge my colleagues again to pay attention to his remarks:

A genuine détente is one that permits competition for our traditional ideas and values on the terrain of an adversary who is firmly committed to ideologic, systematic warfare and global supremacy. To aid him by trade and deals of compromise in "solving" Free World problems virtually forecloses this competition without a poltrade policy aimed at the captive nations, particularly those in the U.S.S.R. and a broader policy designed to intensify the predominant forces of nationalism within the U.S.S.R. Let us not forget our past errors of concept and misdirected action in the region of the U.S.S.R. saved Lenin's tyrannical regime and contributed to the demise of the independent non-Russian republics in the 20's, provided for the industrial foundations of the U.S.S.R. in the 30's, rescued this empire-state from destruction and enabled it to extend its empire in Central Europe, Asia, and Cuba in the 40's and 50's, and under cover of "détente" tolerated its basic implementation of Hanoi's aggression in the 60's and 70's. The perpetuation and repetition of such errors, as evidenced in the present détente process and its euphoric effects, could lead to our own destruction. We, too, could become a captive nation. This is fundamentally the real ground for despair in the West and confidence in the East.

## CAPITAL CLOSEUP

### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with the other Members of this body an interesting article which appeared in the July 1 issue of Hospitals, the Journal of the American Hospital Association, about my good friend and colleague from Kentucky, TIM LEE CARTER.

This "Capital Closeup" details two of the innovative bills Dr. CARTER has introduced this session as well as some of the notable health bills with which he has been closely identified since coming to Congress 10 years ago. As a physician, Dr. CARTER has provided invaluable assistance in the deliberations of this body over crucial issues concerning the health of our citizens.

I offer this article for the edification of my fellow Members about Dr. CARTER and his work.

## CAPITAL CLOSEUP

In a surprise move on Capitol Hill this spring, Rep. Tim Lee Carter, a Republican physician who represents the Fifth District of Kentucky, reintroduced (as H.R. 4747) the Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan, an NHI proposal first introduced during the

Nixon Administration. Many of his colleagues had supposed, incorrectly, that the conservative Congressman would accept President Ford's view that national health insurance should be set aside at least until next year, or when the economy returns to a firmer footing. But Representative Carter decided not to wait, preferring to introduce the measure of his choice, with new provisions for preventive medicine and health education, while NHI continues to be a subject of critical debate.

"I understand and fully respect the President's position," said Representative Carter, "yet . . . I believe that the Congress should formally have before it this thoughtful proposal, with its new preventive medical services section, so that it may be considered in debate with other proposals which have been developed to consider the cluster of concerns we refer to as our national health care crisis."

One of three physicians who are members of Congress, Tim Lee Carter is known for his independent thinking and for his personal involvement in the issues with which he deals. He is a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and has a solid reputation for hard work as the ranking minority member of its Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, better known as the Rogers Subcommittee in recognition of its chairman, Rep. Paul Rogers, a Democrat from Florida.

Representative Carter was first elected to Congress (the 89th) in 1964 and has been reelected to each succeeding Congress. During his more than a decade of service, he has been concerned with every major health issue within the Subcommittee's jurisdiction, including manpower, nurse training, planning, mental health centers, and the National Health Service Corps. He was outspoken in his opposition to U.S. involvement in Vietnam and generally is opposed to foreign aid. He has been a strong advocate of such preventive measures as the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, the Cancer Attack Program, legislation to prevent the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, and a Noise Control Act. He firmly supports HMOs as a form of health care delivery, but only as one form, in a system that he maintains must remain pluralistic.

In April, Representative Carter reinforced his view that the nation needs much more than a reorganized system of health care financing by introducing H.R. 5839, the National Health Education and Promotion Act of 1975. His rationale was that the nation no longer has the "option of unlimited spending for personal health services" and that some way must be found to control demand, but without the reimposition of financial barriers. The Congressman's bill, therefore, is an effort aimed at changing American life-styles, particularly attitudes toward health and the use of health services. Representative Carter firmly holds that unless Congress takes action to expand preventive medicine, the nation's morbidity and mortality rates are unlikely to be improved, no matter what form of NHI is enacted.

"The monies we spend for health education, health promotion, and preventive medicine are miniscule," said Representative Carter when he submitted H.R. 5839. Crediting the American Hospital Association and the Blue Cross Association for having endorsed health education in concept, as well as HEW's Forward Plan in its provisions for preventive medicine, Representative Carter nevertheless charged that public and private agencies in the United States lack any kind of informational exchange; that there is little weighing of results among similar or related health education programs sponsored by different organizations; that information about the theory or state of the art of health education is not easily accessible; and that no agency, public or private, systematically reviews experiments in health education or

their potential. His bill, accordingly, would establish within HEW a national center responsible for research, community health education programs, communications in health education as a component of federal programs.

# STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS CAN BE SUCCESSFUL; NEW YORK STATE PROGRAM SHOWS HOW IT'S DONE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Post Secondary Education, of which I am a member, has been considering legislation to totally revamp the student loan programs. Many of my colleagues feel we should eliminate the guaranteed student loan program because a high percentage of students are defaulting on their loans after graduation.

The New York State Higher Education Assistance Corp. manages student loan programs in New York. They have just issued their final report which shows what can be done to lower the default rate and improve collections substantially. It indicates that the problem with the student loan program is not so much irresponsible students not paying back loans, but rather the need for improved management of the system.

Under the Federal Higher Education Act of 1965, two student loan projects were established: the guaranteed student loan program—GSLP—which is run by independent State agencies like NYHEAC for the Federal Government; and the Federal insured student loan program—FISLP—which relies directly on the Federal Government.

Since 1965, the State programs have proven themselves to be consistently more efficient than the federally administered programs. The GSLP has lent out over 25 percent more money than the FISLP while at the same time maintaining less than half the default rate of the Federal programs.

The NYHEAC is a glowing example of what the State programs can do with proper management. According to its 1974-75 record, the NYHEAC has been responsible for two-thirds of all the default collections for the entire Nation and has achieved a 12-percent reduction in purchase of default claims.

Why are State programs such as the NYHEAC performing with such superior efficiency to the Federal programs? An essential reason is the more direct and continuing relationship State agencies maintain with the schools, lenders, and students during the in-school period of the loan. When a lender submits a default claim, the student borrowers are pursued far more extensively by the State agencies. This further reduces the default rate.

The report also points out many instances of inequity in Government's treatment of the Federal and State programs. For example, State programs such as the NYHEAC are required to pay for

all their administrative costs for default collection with no reimbursement forthcoming from the Federal Government. All Federal program expenditures for default collection are paid for by the U.S. Office of Education. Yet, despite inequities such as this one, the State agencies still maintain a higher level of efficiency in default prevention and recovery.

If we are to continue to assist deserving young men and women obtain a post-secondary education, we must continue student loan programs. They operate in the best American tradition. Students pay their own way for their education after they are out in the world working. Efforts to eliminate loan programs would be better directed at reforming the management and operations of the program, particularly the Federal loan program.

The experience of NYHEAC shows that loan programs can work and can help large numbers of students obtain a college education. I hope my colleagues will profit from knowing about successful programs such as the one we have in New York State.

## TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT BY DECREE

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, Congress has created a vast network of regulatory agencies which are now assuming near-dictatorial powers, stifling initiative and individualism, hamstringing the Nation's economic recovery, and costing consumers billions of dollars a year.

To an increasing extent, we are being ruled by arbitrary edicts issued by unelected Washington bureaucrats—with results ranging from absurd to tragic, as pointed out by the following article from the Reader's Digest:

### TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT BY DECREE!

To an increasing extent, we are being ruled by arbitrary edicts issued by unelected Washington bureaucrats—with results ranging from absurd to tragic

(By John Barron)

The decree from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) fell upon Bostonians like an edict from some ancient king. Beginning March 1, 1975, no one might park on a downtown street between 7 and 10 a.m. Forty percent of all spaces in Boston's parking garages must be kept empty during the same hours. Employers must eliminate one fourth of all employee parking spaces. By making it difficult, if not impossible, for Boston workers to drive to their jobs, the Washington bureaucrats who handed down these sweeping orders hoped to reduce air pollution.

Boston community leaders were appalled. "We cannot eliminate the car until there is a viable alternative," declared Mayor Kevin White. Businessmen predicted serious economic loss and unemployment, as well as personal hardship and traffic chaos. Nevertheless, the EPA all last year stubbornly proclaimed its determination to compel Bostonians to do what it wanted, regardless of the consequences. Repeatedly it warned employers that they were liable to a year's imprisonment and a \$25,000 fine if they disobeyed. Threatened with Congressional in-

tervention, the EPA finally, last February, modified its Draconian decrees and granted the city more time to gird for their effects. Grateful for the reprieve, Boston Chamber of Commerce executive William F. Chouinard nonetheless said, "I hate to think what might have happened if we had not fought like hell."

### MASS MEDDLING

Even though postponed, the orders arrogantly visited upon Boston are symptomatic of an insidious change which is occurring in governmental processes. Traditionally, Americans have been governed according to laws enacted by elected representatives answerable to voters. Today, Americans increasingly find their lives regulated by decrees emanating from bureaucrats who are, in effect, accountable to no one.

The stream of bureaucratic dictates pouring out of Washington has turned into a flood. In 1973, the *Federal Register* needed 35,591 pages to publish all the new decrees and decisions; last year it required 45,422 pages. Random examination of the *Register* suggests how far the bureaucracy has thrust itself into the ordinary business of ordinary people. Navel-Orange Regulation 311, for instance, prescribes how many oranges may be shipped from California and Arizona counties during a specific one-week period. Contractors in Allegheny County, Pa., are informed that their bricklayers must be paid \$9.25 an hour, whereas bricklayers in Adams and York counties, in another part of the state, can receive \$7.65. Arbitrary *Register* regulations may nullify a union contract, require a corporation to spend millions on new equipment, or deny a town the right to approve a new shopping center.

Consumer advocate Ralph Nader points out that senseless or incompetent rulings by federal regulatory agencies drive up prices by suppressing competition, stifling innovation and perpetuating inefficiency. A Senate subcommittee estimates that private business spends \$18 billion annually on paperwork demanded by federal bureaucrats, while the General Accounting Office calculated that 1973 paperwork cost the government itself \$15 billion. But the gravest consequence of all this bureaucratic meddling carries no price tag. It is eloquently summed up by Sen. Sam Ervin (D., N.C.), Congress' leading constitutional authority, who retired this year after presiding over the Senate Watergate investigation. "Government by bureaucratic decree threatens freedom itself," Ervin declares. "The pursuit of no goal justifies the destruction, or even the erosion, of freedom."

Few Americans would dispute that abolishing racial discrimination, promoting industrial and consumer safety, and cleaning up the environment are worthy goals. The trouble is that Congress has created vast new bureaucracies with sweeping powers to pursue such goals as they see fit. All too often, the results are tragic.

### BUSINESS BUSTER

Marlin Toy Products, Inc., in Horicon, Wis., used to provide jobs for 85 of the town's 1400 residents. Its most profitable products were two popular toys designed for babies. One was a transparent plastic sphere containing artificial birds and tiny, bright-colored plastic pellets. The other was a similar sphere containing pellets and artificial butterflies. When the spheres rolled, the birds or butterflies fluttered, the pellets rattled and a child enjoyed motion, color and sound.

In November 1972, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), then responsible for product safety, suddenly informed Marlin that the toys were unsafe, reasoning that, if a sphere broke, a child might be tempted to eat the pellets.

Since Marlin first marketed the toys in 1962, millions of Americans had purchased them. Not one had complained to the company of any harmful results. The toys had already passed three rigorous safety tests—



Marlin's, an insurance company's and a department store's. Nevertheless, Marlin agreed promptly to recall all the spheres and remove the pellets. Within a month, the FDA said it was satisfied and promised to remove the toys from the next published list of banned products.

Marlin proceeded to manufacture hundreds of thousands of the toys, hoping to recover, through the 1973 holiday sales, the losses from the 1972 recalls. But in September 1973 the newly formed Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) issued a "Special Holiday List" of dangerous toys whose sale was prohibited—including the toys Marlin had redesigned months before to FDA satisfaction.

Not until early December did Marlin's company and Wisconsin officials succeed in getting CPSC to acknowledge that it had made an "editorial error." It was too late. Stores all over the country had canceled toy orders, and Marlin had lost at least \$1.2 million. Today the company is on the verge of collapse.

#### "ARBITRARY . . . CAPRICIOUS"

Congress in 1970 created the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), endowing it with authority to dictate work rules to virtually every segment of American business, from the corporate giants of Detroit to mom-and-pop shops at rural crossroads. OSHA inspectors can walk into any business unannounced, search the premises without a warrant and levy fine without a hearing or trial. Industry and labor alike recognize that there are industrial hazards which require intelligent remedies, but too often OSHA simply makes a nitpicking nuisance of itself. Consider:

In Newport Beach, Calif., an OSHA inspector visited Blackie's Boatyard, where owner Arsene "Blackie" Gadarian and six workers repair small craft. Pointing to a man without a life jacket who was working in a boat tied to the pier, the inspector asked, "What would happen if he fell in the water?"

"He would stand up," Gadarian replied. "The water's only three feet deep all along the pier." Still, the inspector thought there should be a ladder at the pier's end. Gadarian said he would nail up a ladder.

Three weeks later, OSHA formally notified Gadarian that he had violated its ladder regulation—Section 1910.84(c)(4)—and was liable to a fine of as much as \$1000. When Gadarian asked to see the rule, OSHA sent him a 248-page document a month later. Nowhere could Gadarian discover any reference to ladders. Asked for clarification, OSHA sent a 48-page supplement saying only that a ladder must be installed in the vicinity of a dock where boats are repaired.

Because Gadarian already had four ladders near his pier, he decided to appeal the fine. OSHA set the fine at only \$15, but Gadarian refused to pay.

A battery of government lawyers assembled to argue the OSHA case before a specially appointed federal hearing examiner and a flock of other federal officials. Gadarian, helped by his wife, acted as his own lawyer. The proceedings lasted four hours before Gadarian's innocence was certified. Gadarian's wife would not let him buy a transcript of the proceedings. It cost \$500.

OSHA can be just as foolishly autocratic in dealing with big matters as with little. At a cost of \$100,000 annually, the Continental Can Corp. effectively safeguards its employees from noise by providing comfortable ear protectors and insisting that they be worn. OSHA itself admits that the protectors reduce the noise level well below federal standards. Nevertheless, OSHA demanded two years ago that Continental Can "engineer" noise abatement by building sound shields around thousands of machines at a cost of \$33.5 million—contending that some workers might be too "ignorant or obstinate" to wear the ear protectors. Continental contested the OSHA decree.

After reviewing 1000 pages of testimony,

Judge Robert N. Burchmore last October issued what added up to a searing indictment of both the judgment and the competence of OSHA. A government "expert had claimed that sound shields could be designed and installed in two months. The court ruled that after seven more years of research it might be feasible to install them. OSHA had had to admit that it had found not a single employee who was not wearing the ear protectors. Judge Burchmore dismissed the OSHA ruling, calling it "arbitrary to the point of capriciousness."

#### PASSION AND THE POLICE

The Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (EEOC) was created to ensure that employers should not discriminate against minorities in hiring and promotions. But the EEOC now ranges far beyond this stated mission; its flagrant excesses have provoked outspoken criticism from even longtime champions of minority causes.

Late last year, for example, the EEOC issued an astonishing set of decrees against the police department of Houston, Texas. By EEOC's own admission, this department has had, in recent years, a commendable record of employing minority personnel, who presently compose about 40 percent of the force. But the Houston police require that applicants have a high-school diploma, and they refuse to hire convicted criminals, people dishonorably discharged from the armed services, and those with a history of defaulting on debts.

The EEOC asserted that the ratio of individuals convicted of crimes, dishonorably discharged from the military, or marked as bad credit risks, is higher among blacks and other minorities than among whites. Therefore, ruled the agency, the Houston police department is guilty of racial discrimination and must cease investigating the backgrounds of prospective officers. It threatened legal action unless the Houston police opened their ranks to convicts, those with dishonorable discharges from the armed services, those who had not completed high school.

"If we do not even have the right to ask a man if he has been convicted, we could turn over the department to a bunch of criminals, the very element we're supposed to fight!" exploded Chief Carol Lynn. "Hire a convicted kidnaper, burglar, rapist, murderer as a policeman? My God!" Houston's leading black newspaper, *Forward Times*, published a full-page editorial ridiculing EEOC and defending the police. To all protests, the EEOC has so far responded with bureaucratic contempt for common sense.

Meanwhile, EEOC's real business often goes unattended. It has a backlog of 100,000 cases, and now takes an average of 28 months to process a complaint. In their passion to pursue their mandate, EEOC investigators frequently fail to get facts straight. As a result, the EEOC general counsel has to return to the field as "unsuitable for litigation" between 80 and 90 percent of the cases submitted to his office. Yet this is the bureaucracy that has the power to impose racial and sexual quotas at all levels of business, and to drag any employer into a costly lawsuit at will.

#### THE SINGLE MOST POWERFUL

But the Congressional creation that threatens to grow into the most fearsome bureaucratic monster of all is the Environmental Protection Agency. Under a pervasive umbrella of power conferred by the National Environmental Policy Act, the Clean Air Amendments, the Water Pollution Control Act and the Noise Control Act, EPA has claimed for itself authority unprecedented in American peacetime history. Indeed, Prof. Irving Kristol of New York University recently wrote: "If the EPA's conception of its mission is permitted to stand, it will be the single most powerful branch of government, having far greater direct control over our individual lives than Congress or the Execu-

tive or state and local government." Professor Kristol does not exaggerate. Consider:

EPA asserts the right to veto construction of virtually anything that might generate a substantial volume of traffic. Thus, unless Congress intercedes, as of January 1, 1976, local communities may not permit development of a major shopping center, hotel, stadium or factory without approval from Washington.

In Gary, Ind., the U.S. Steel Corp. tried to meet EPA requirements by building two new installations of non-polluting furnaces. But initially their output was limited by factors beyond the company's control: a power failure that damaged its furnaces, the coal strike and a construction strike. So U.S. Steel last fall asked EPA permission to keep its one remaining open-hearth installation in operation six months more. It was told that the installation could be kept open for three months with a \$2300 fine for each day of operation. Instead, the company closed the installation, and hundreds of workers are losing their jobs as a result.

An infestation of deadly tussock moths in 1972 defoliated 174,000 acres of magnificent Washington and Oregon forests. To prevent further ravages, state officials and conservationists pleaded with EPA to allow a carefully controlled spraying of DDT. EPA stubbornly refused even a temporary removal of its ban against DDT. Unchecked, the multiplying moths by the summer of 1973 had afflicted 700,000 acres of timber. Faced with Congressional uproar and a lawsuit, EPA in February 1974 relented and authorized use of DDT. Helicopters sprayed the forest, and the infestation ended. But the devastation inflicted by doctrinaire bureaucrats endures.

#### ULTIMATE REMEDY

Nearly two centuries ago, the people of Boston started one of history's most important revolutions in the name of freedom. In the years since, millions of Americans have risked their lives to preserve that freedom. It is inconceivable that we will now sit back passively and allow it to be lost to bureaucratic usurpation.

The remedy lies in Congress, which created the problem in the first place. Congress should reappraise each federal agency, with a view to outright abolition of those that have obviously outlived their usefulness. It should withdraw from the others the vast grants of arbitrary power that it has bestowed. And Congress should define the powers left to bureaucracies in language so clear and explicit that no officials can expand their power beyond Congressional intent. Finally, broad national policies required to protect consumers, workers, minorities and the environment should be implemented through specific legislation rather than bureaucratic fiat.

If the people don't like the results, then—in the next election—they can remove the members of Congress responsible. That is why the American system has always provided that power must be exercised by elected representatives instead of by bureaucrats who have earned the vote of no one. If freedom is to survive, power must remain in the hands of elected representatives.

#### FREEDOM CELEBRATION

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation approaches its 200th birthday, we will witness countless celebrations of our independence and tradition of individual rights. Recently, it was my good fortune to share in such a celebration—a most

unusual and inspiring one. While in Detroit, I was able to take part in the Bicentennial musical program entitled "Freedom Celebration," presented by the 250 Voice Michigan Concert Choir with symphonic strings and brass. The choir was chosen from among hundreds throughout the country to appear at the National Religious Broadcasters Convention in Washington where President Gerald Ford was the main speaker. Under the direction of the internationally known choral director, Thurlow Spurr, this magnificent group of musicians has been presenting concerts to standing-room-only crowds for the past 36 months.

One of those concerts took place in my own congressional district on June 26 of this year. Through the tremendous efforts of Mr. Dale E. Schroeder, the people of Monroe, Mich. were able to enjoy this unforgettable musical. The Monroe program featured special soloists John Hall, Lucia Simmons and Larnelle Harris, accompanied by Shirley Balmer and orchestra. In addition, the Armed Forces Color Guard and the award-winning Plymouth Fife and Drum Corps, staged and produced in spectraphonic sound, were featured. A very special attraction of "Freedom Celebration" was the appearance of Apollo 15 astronaut, Jim Irwin. Having driven the first vehicle on the Moon, Mr. Irwin related the dramatic and exciting events of his space mission.

Mr. Schroeder's organizational talents were well rewarded. These musicians from Eastern Michigan—having just returned from a concert tour in Washington, D.C.—delighted their Monroe audience with a spectacular program of familiar patriotic songs as well as new music written especially for this concert. The program became a real celebration with the addition of audience participation in several selections.

Besides the musical excellence of the choir, its director, Mr. Spurr, also created an extravaganza of beautiful costuming, special lighting effects and ingenious production. No effort was spared to present the very best in music and guests. Civic, business, labor, and religious leaders, together with the community of Monroe, enjoyed a heart-lifting tribute to our heritage.

Mr. Schroeder, Mr. Spurr, the choir and all the members of "Freedom Celebration" should be applauded for their contribution to our Bicentennial year. Celebrations such as these help to remind us of the greatness and glory of our past and inspire us to meet the responsibilities of the future. I encourage other civic leaders, like Mr. Schroeder, in Michigan and elsewhere, to bring the "Freedom Celebration" to their communities. I commend the Michigan Concert Choir as it continues to celebrate our 200 years of freedom.

#### HEALTH MANPOWER ACT H.R. 5546

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my support of H.R. 5546. It

is needed legislation in a crucial area of concern, the maldistribution of physicians and health care services.

The medical schools and other health care related institutions in question here are funded by the Federal Government on the sound basis that they are a national resource. The Federal Government now provides more than 45 percent of total medical school support, and in the past this has been unconditional funding. H.R. 5546 would continue to provide direct assistance to health care institutions and students but would stipulate that the Federal Government take a more active role in determining policy, in an effort to bring about needed changes in the quality, quantity, and distribution of medical services in the country.

I am pleased to note that this bill provides for the expansion of such laudable programs as the capitation grant program and the National Health Service Corps—NHSC—scholarship program. It would provide direct assistance to schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, public health, optometry, veterinary medicine and podiatry on a per student basis on the condition that these schools would have to expand enrollments to include students from States without separate institutions, and place training facilities whenever possible in rural field locations.

Since implementation in 1963 of the Health Profession's Educational Assistance Act, which was extended and broadened in 1965, 1968, and 1971, first year enrollments in medical schools have increased from almost 9,000 to nearly 14,000. Graduations increased in this same 10 year time span from 1963 to 1973 from 7,300 to 10,500. The Nixon administration claimed in 1974 that the Nation's health manpower shortage was "rapidly ending". President Nixon alleged in his February 1974 health message to Congress:

The Nation's total supply of health professionals is becoming sufficient to meet our needs during the next decade. In fact, oversupply could possibly become a problem.

Even if it were true that the "aggregate" supply of physicians and other health professionals was sufficient to create problems of "over-supply", the situation is dependent upon an analysis of distribution of the aggregate before any conclusions of adequacy or inadequacy can be made.

If availability of health care is taken into consideration according to various population groupings in the country, it is clear that the supply of health care professionals is maldistributed geographically, the available physicians are maldistributed by specialty and, as an added consequence of these sad facts, we are increasingly reliant upon foreign medical school graduates to supplement our own lack of adequate health manpower.

The number of foreign medical school graduates—or FMG's—entering the United States to practice has increased remarkably during the last 19 years. In 1959, FMG's comprised less than 6 percent of all physicians in the United States. By 1963, that percentage had increased to 10.7. Today it is 20 percent. Recent HEW projections indicate that by 1970 the proportion of FMG's practicing

medicine in the United States could be as high as 30 percent. Almost half, or 46 percent, of all physicians newly licensed to practice in 1972 were FMG's.

This constitutes an alarming tendency toward dependence upon foreign manpower to provide health care in this country. Further, our problem is aggravated by this influx due to the fact that the great majority of FMG's are specialists. Only 10 percent of the FMG's in the United States as of December 31, 1972, were in general practice.

In data collected on physician availability, which is the most widely studied area of health care, and has the most reliable numbers and will suffice to demonstrate the kinds of maldistribution affecting the Nation's health consumers, there is a wide variance in patient-to-physician ratios. The disproportionate accumulations of physicians occur, as one might suspect, in the Northeast and the West. New York has 500 patients per physician and California has 595 patients per physician while South Dakota is struggling with 71 physicians for each 100,000 in population, or a ratio of 1,400 to 1. Similarly, Mississippi has a ratio of 1,300 to 1.

On a local scale as well, the disparity between rural and urban health care capabilities is profound, even in the West, which as a whole is relatively well served. In my district, in fact, a substantial area has been designated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as "critically short" of doctors. This region has only one emergency medical facility, and it has faced the necessity of closing due to a lack of medical personnel. The fortunate location nearby of Travis Air Force Base has provided some relief in this situation as military physician have been supplied to staff the emergency room. Were it not for this circumstance, many of my constituents would be faced with the necessity of driving up to 40 miles for emergency treatment.

The national average, which concerns itself with the aggregate totals, is a ratio of 769 persons per physician. When considerations of location are included, the glaring inequities strip away much of the encouragement one might gain from reports of increased enrollments in medical schools. If physicians continue to practice in the areas of their own choice, and if there is no voluntary change in their tendencies to locate in dense population centers, we will find ourselves with maldistribution problems regardless of aggregate supply.

An answer to the dilemma of maldistribution, then, is incentive encouragement of the type outlined in H.R. 5546, where a newly accredited graduate could repay his debt to the Federal Government which has subsidized his education directly through capitation grants and also by assistance to the medical schools and health care related institutions, by serving 1 year for each year of federally funded education in a medically underserved area.

For those who fear that the payback provision establishes a dangerous precedent in Federal assistance programs, on the basis that all recipients of aid may be asked to repay their grants in a similar manner, it is important to point out



that the health care capitation grant program is a unique case in which these moneys have been heretofore provided unconditionally. Other institutions have always received funding upon agreement to specific conditions set by the Federal agency administering the funds. The capitation grant payback scheme, with its provision for an alternate to payback in the form of service in areas of public need is a means for a proper level of Federal incentive, while allowing for an acceptable level of freedom of choice for the students and institutions involved. This may help to establish physicians in locations they might otherwise overlook, and would tend to redistribute the investment of Federal dollars more suitable according to the needs of the people.

#### FOUR YEARS OF LEADERSHIP ON THE TARIFF COMMISSION

**HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

**Mr. CEDERBERG.** Mr. Speaker, in mid-June our good friend and former colleague, Catherine May Bedell, completed 4 years of distinguished service to the Nation as Chairman of the U.S. Tariff Commission. With Vice Chairman Joseph O. Parker, Catherine Bedell has revitalized an agency whose activities have become increasingly important as we in the United States expand and improve our trading relationships around the world.

The Congress took special note of the need for a strong and effective trade agency when, during the 93d Congress, we passed legislation creating the U.S. International Trade Commission with additional powers and authority. As we face the new round of trade negotiations, talks which will have the most profound effect on our future trade relationships, I think it is valuable to take a backward look to the service of Chairman Bedell and her able Vice Chairman. They have served the country well, and their insights into the problems their agency has faced and the progress toward solutions they have made, can help the Congress as we deal with trade problems and the coming negotiations.

Catherine Bedell has passed the reins of leadership at the Commission, but I am confident that she will continue to serve her country with distinction. Herewith are her thoughts on 4 years of distinguished leadership:

**A REPORT ON STEWARDSHIP BY CATHERINE BEDELL, CHAIRMAN AND JOSEPH O. PARKER, VICE CHAIRMAN**

On June 16, 1975, we completed four years of service as Chairman and Vice Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission and its successor agency, the United States International Trade Commission. On June 17, 1975, a new Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission assumed these responsibilities under a provision of the Trade Act of 1974 which provides for the rotation of these two positions every eighteen months.

It is with this in mind that we are submitting a brief review of our stewardship for the last four years—one of the busiest and most challenging periods in the Commission's 59-year history.

Upon the assumption of the duties of our offices, we began studying, reviewing and analyzing the work of the Commission in order to make an assessment of its operations and the performance of its statutory responsibilities.

We found a number of weaknesses and deficiencies. The Commission did not have an organizational structure with well-defined lines of authority and responsibility that provided for the kind of supervision and coordination necessary to achieve an efficient operation. The principal units or divisions of the Commission tended to operate more or less autonomously.

The agency was struggling to meet a sharply rising workload. Investigations to be conducted pursuant to statutory direction had more than tripled over the previous year. Complex studies of major significance requested by the President and the Congress pertaining to the competitiveness of U.S. industry, multinational enterprises, customs valuation, and tariff and non-tariff trade barriers were far behind schedule. Appropriate administrative controls were varied and inadequate. A professional staff of unique expertise and ability had been weakened by declining appropriations and was in need of better direction to meet the increased workload and the new demands being made on the Commission. There was an urgent need for modern management and personnel techniques. The building was in a poor state of repair. Working conditions were inefficient and in need of upgrading.

On the basis of our analyses, it was apparent that the agency was understaffed and underbudgeted and was ill prepared to cope with either the demands being placed upon it by a rapidly mounting caseload, or with the demands being placed upon it by the President and the Congress because of prospective international trade negotiations.

After defining the nature of the Commission's problems, our first step was to set up procedures to expedite the completion of pending major studies. A number of other actions were taken to assure that the agency would fulfill its statutory responsibilities and improve its capability to be more responsive to the needs of the Executive and Legislative Branches of government.

The assistance and support of the Executive and Legislative Branches in a budget and staff building process were sought and obtained. Appropriations increased from \$4.4 million in FY 1971 to \$8.9 million in FY 1975. The Commission's authorized ceiling of permanent positions for the same period increased from 255 to 400.

Concurrently with the budget and staff building process, consideration was given to the whole question of improved management and organizational effectiveness. Previous management studies and executive reorganization plans in which recommendations had been made but never adopted were reviewed.

At the Commission's request, the Office of Management and Budget brought together a group of experts from the Civil Service Commission and other departments of the Federal Government to assist in analyzing the Commission's internal organization and administrative and management procedures. The report of this expert group was submitted to the Commission for its consideration.

Upon further analysis of this and other reports, the Commission instructed the staff to develop a reorganization plan designed to meet specific needs. As the Commission was about to take action on these recommendations, the Congress began its con-

sideration of legislation which ultimately became the Trade Act of 1974. The Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance requested the Commission to defer action on any internal organization decision until the Congress had worked its will on the Commission's statutory functions, and it had had the benefit of the views of the General Accounting Office.<sup>1</sup> We have been advised that the General Accounting Office has completed its review, and the report of the Comptroller General has recently been forwarded to the Senate Finance Committee.

While reorganization was aimed at the long-range overall improvement of the agency's operations, it was necessary for the Commission to take a number of actions that enabled it to conduct more efficiently its day-to-day operations within the existing organization. The Commission established the position of Executive Director and delegated to that office extensive responsibilities for internal administrative minutiae which gave the Commission more time to devote to substantive policy.

An Office of Personnel and Management Systems was established. That office has enabled the Commission to improve personnel management and to assure compliance with Civil Service Commission regulations and requirements, thus meeting the criticisms that had been made by the Civil Service Commission. This has resulted in major improvements in the Commission's recruitment techniques and procedures, and enabled the Commission to meet its personnel needs more expeditiously.

A survey and review was also made of the Commission's records management capability with assistance from the National Archives and Records Service. This review disclosed a number of deficiencies, which are being corrected. Historical records and other records not needed on a current basis have been transferred to Archives.

Important steps were also taken to improve the working environment for Commission employees, including building renovations and an upgrading of office space and facilities and an overall improvement of employee work conditions. Internal communications have been improved. Greater use has been made of automatic data processing, microfiche, and other mechanical aids to improve the quality and capability of the Commission's work and to improve work productivity.

While taking these steps, work continued on the long-term goal of improving and strengthening the Commission in all areas of responsibility. Requests were made and approval was given by the General Services Administration and the Congress for a major renovation of the Commission building which is designed to bring the building up to Federal standards in all respects. All the necessary preparation work has been done, and the course of direction has been set on the \$5.7 million program.

One of our major goals, that of the efficient reorganization of the agency has not yet been accomplished. In our judgment, this is essential if the Commission is to carry out its responsibilities efficiently and to provide the assistance to the Congress and the President that is expected. As heretofore indicated, our work in this respect was interrupted, but the major studies and analyses have been completed. The problems have been identified, and the course of direction is clear.

As soon as the report is received from the Comptroller General and the Commission has heard further from the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, it will be in a position to complete its reorganizational task.

<sup>1</sup> The Commission had earlier requested assistance from the General Accounting Office but was advised that it would not be able to respond because of its pending workload.

In our judgment, with improved reorganizational effectiveness, the Commission can establish and maintain a higher state of readiness and be in a position to provide the Congress and the President with timely advice and economic foresight on the complicated issues relating to international trade.

# DÉTENTE ATTACK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, by extending an invitation to host the visit of Russian author, Alexandr Solzhenitsyn, AFL-CIO President George Meany has, in my judgment, performed a great service in promoting the knowledge of the oppressive conditions under Communist totalitarianism.

A very timely and thoughtworthy commentary on Mr. Solzhenitsyn's address to the AFL-CIO appeared in the July 12 edition of the weekly newsletter of the Illinois State AFL-CIO, whose highly respected editor, Stanley L. Johnson, serves as president of the Illinois State AFL-CIO.

I believe the Members will be especially interested in reading this commentary which expresses Alexandr Solzhenitsyn's personal viewpoints, in light of current developments:

## DÉTENTE ATTACK

America and other Western democracies, apparently blinded to the true goals of worldwide communism, will pay a heavy price if they do not soon abandon their present policy of detente with the USSR. Soviet dissident Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn warned at an AFL-CIO banquet honoring the exiled Russian novelist.

Speaking bluntly to his audience of 2,500 labor leaders and government officials including two Cabinet members of the Ford Administration, the Nobel laureate declared that "the Soviet Union has used detente in its own interests, is using it now and will continue to use it in its own interests."

Nothing has changed in Communist ideology, Solzhenitsyn said. The goal are the same as they have been since the Bolsheviks rose to power in the Revolution of 1917-20: the subjugation of peoples everywhere, he charged.

Speaking in Russian, his words translated and simultaneously delivered in English, Solzhenitsyn praised the American Labor Movement for its continuing anti-Communist position.

"The AFL-CIO has never given in to these illusions," he said. "The American workers' movement has never allowed itself to be blinded and mistake slavery for freedom. And I today, in behalf of all of our oppressed people, thank you for this."

He noted that the AFL, in 1947, while liberals of the West were swearing there was none in the USSR, published and distributed a map of the Soviet chain of slave labor camps. The maps matched the author's account of the camp system in The Gulag Archipelago, his own account of Soviet internal oppression.

"On our crowded planet there are no longer any internal affairs," Solzhenitsyn said, paraphrasing a passage from his 1972 Nobel Prize lecture.

"Interfere more and more" in Soviet affairs, he urged. "Interfere as much as you can. We beg you to come and interfere."

"Whenever you help the persons persecuted in the Soviet Union," he reminded his audience, "you not only display magnanimity and nobility, you're defending not only them but yourselves as well. You're defending your own future." . . .

"The situation in the world is not just dangerous," he said.

"It isn't just threatening—it is catastrophic. Something that is incomprehensible to the ordinary human mind has taken place," he continued. . . .

"We already hear voices in your country and in the West—give up Korea and we will live quietly. Give up Portugal, of course, give up Japan; give up Israel; give up Taiwan, the Philippines, Malaysia, Thailand, give up 10 more African countries; just let us live in peace and quiet."

"Just let us drive our big cars on our splendid highways; just let us play tennis and golf in peace and quiet; just let us mix our cocktails in peace and quiet."

But these are voices of people who do not understand the true nature of communism, Solzhenitsyn declared.

"The Communist leaders respect only firmness and have contempt and laugh at persons who continually give in to them," he added. "I can tell you that only firmness will make it possible to withstand the assaults of Communist totalitarianism." . . .

Recalling the political philosophy of Aristotle, Solzhenitsyn observed: "One cannot think only in the low level of political calculations. It's necessary to think also of what is noble, and what is honorable—not only what is profitable." . . .

Solzhenitsyn's address was his first major speech in the West since he was deported and deprived of his Russian citizenship by Soviet leaders in February 1974. His exile followed publication of The Gulag Archipelago.

AFL-CIO President George Meany, who had invited the noted author to make a Federation-Sponsored lecture tour of the U.S. shortly after his deportation, introduced Solzhenitsyn as "the single figure who has raised highest the flame of liberty."

"The American Trade Union movement," Meany noted, "from its beginning to the present, has been dedicated to the firm unyielding belief in freedom—freedom for all mankind, as well as for ourselves."

"God knows, the world needs to think more about human freedom. The world needs to think more about those who are losing their freedom every day," Meany said.

## NATIONAL CAN CO. MOVES ON ILLEGAL ALIEN PROBLEM

HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, one of my chief concerns as a member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, and International Law has been the problem of illegal aliens and their impact on our serious domestic employment situation.

The Immigration Subcommittee under the distinguished leadership of Chairman ERLBERG has recently completed action on H.R. 8713, which seeks to deal effectively with this matter. As a cosponsor of the Rodino-Erlberg bill, I am pleased to say that it will come before the full Judiciary Committee next week. Hopefully, it will be acted on by the House in the near future.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the people's rep-

resentatives are doing their part to deal with this difficulty. However, as with everything we deal with in Congress, the people—individuals, business, labor—must be willing to take action themselves if the problems are to be solved.

I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of our colleagues an instance of just such necessary cooperation by private industry. The National Can Co., headquartered in Chicago, has recently instituted a program to insure against the hiring of illegal aliens. National Can President Frank W. Considine has stated that his company's goal is to open up more jobs for legal residents of the United States:

Our goal is to put the U.S. worker back to work, as quickly as possible.

I am sure that our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, join me in commending National Can for its pioneering efforts in this area and hope that other companies will soon undertake similar responsible approaches to meeting the illegal alien problem.

At this point, I insert in the Record Mr. Considine's letter to me and a news release describing the measures his company has instituted:

JUNE 3, 1975.

HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RUSSO: At our annual shareholders meeting on April 11, 1975, I made the announcement that the National Can Corporation was adopting a policy to insure against the hiring of illegal aliens. Furthermore, that the corporation, and I personally, would be spearheading a drive to recruit other businesses to do the same.

General Leonard Chapman, Commissioner of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service, has assured me that if all of business would adopt a similar policy, more than one million jobs would be opened up for U.S. workers within a matter of months; an additional two million jobs could be opened up over a period of three to four years.

I know how deeply concerned you personally are about the unemployment in the United States today, therefore, I hope that I can count on your support in this program.

We would welcome any comments or suggestions you have concerning this program. A press release summarizing my remarks at our annual meeting is enclosed for your information.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.  
Sincerely,

F. W. CONSIDINE.

## NATIONAL CAN ENACTS MEASURES TO INSURE AGAINST HIRING ILLEGAL ALIENS—HEADS DRIVE TO RECRUIT OTHER BUSINESS TO DO THE SAME

CHICAGO, ILL., April 11.—With unemployment at an all-time high since the depression, National Can Corporation announced today that it is enacting measures to insure against the hiring of illegal aliens.

According to the United States Immigration Service, it is the first major U.S. corporation to publicly adopt such a policy.

Frank W. Considine, president and chief executive officer of National Can, in making the announcement at the corporation's annual meeting in Chicago, said that in addition to its own policy, National Can would spearhead a drive in cooperation with the U.S. Immigration Service to get other companies to adopt similar measures. Considine personally will head up the drive.



General Leonard F. Chapman, commissioner of the U.S. Immigration Service, said that a concerted effort by all of business not to employ illegal aliens would help to open up more than one million jobs for unemployed U.S. workers within a matter of months; it could make available over a period of three to four years an additional two million or more jobs.

"The time when our nation could absorb the world's unemployment is long past," Considine said in making his announcement. "I don't see how we can any longer justify taking lightly the hiring of people who enter the country illegally, violating our laws, when so many of our own people are begging for jobs."

Considine stated that government statistics show that illegal aliens don't just occupy the low paying, unwanted jobs.

"Quite to the contrary," he said. "Illegal aliens hold jobs throughout our entire employment stream."

"It is estimated that more than one million illegal aliens are in New York; more than half a million in Chicago," Considine continued. "You can be sure that the people employed in these areas aren't harvesting crops."

According to the Immigration Service, more than two and one-half million illegal aliens come into the United States each year. They arrive from nearly every country in the world.

As unemployment in Europe continues to grow, the number of illegal aliens migrating to this country is expected to rise.

According to General Chapman, the surest way of shutting them out is to turn off the magnet that attracts them here . . . jobs.

"This is what we are trying to encourage major corporations to do," General Chapman said. "This is why National Can's public policy and leadership role in this vital issue is so important to our solution to the illegal alien problem."

National Can is listing on all of its employment forms, both temporary and permanent, salaried and hourly, the question: "Do you have the legal right to be in this country?"

It is posting signs in each of its plants, informing workers of the company's policy on the employment of illegal aliens. It is informing each of its employees that it is cooperating fully with the U.S. Immigration Service and that plants will be open for regular immigration inspection.

"This puts the illegal alien on notice that National Can is one company to avoid," General Chapman said.

"If more corporations would adopt this policy it would eventually transmit to the illegal alien that there are no jobs for them here. It would discourage them from coming to America on an illegal basis."

The General said that illegal aliens who were employed at company plants posting this information would most likely leave.

"They know that sooner or later with our regular inspections that they would be detected," he said.

Considine stated that this is of course National Can's goal . . . to open up more jobs for legal residents.

"If we can do something to help ease the unemployment problem in the U.S.," Considine said, "then we feel that we will have truly accomplished something."

"Our goal is to put the U.S. worker back to work, as quickly as possible. We feel that this program with the U.S. Immigration Service is an important step in the right direction."

National Can Corporation has 62 plants across the U.S. It employs over 14,000 people. In addition to its U.S. plants, the company has 12 plants overseas. Its 1974 annual sales were \$710 million.

## AROOSTOOK'S MAGNIFICENT GADFLY

### HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues from urban districts with heavy concentrations of television and radio stations and multisection daily newspapers may not pay very much attention to weekly newspapers. But those of us from more rural areas, such as my district in Maine, realize that weeklies, the most durable news medium in American history, continue to be a vital form of communication in small towns throughout this country.

Weekly newspapers are the last bastion of true individualism in American journalism. Unlike the corporate product of vast staffs which work in urban television, radio and newspaper operations, many newspapers remain one-man operations. The weekly editor traditionally has been writer, editor, printer, and publisher, all rolled into one, and he frequently performs the function of conscience of the community as well as reporting the goings-on about town.

One of the finest examples of this vanishing breed of American journalists is Kingdon Harvey, who for 45 years has published the Fort Fairfield, Maine, Review. King Harvey's Review has an influence in Aroostook County and throughout the State much greater than its small circulation—only 2,300 copies—seems to warrant.

The prestige of the paper comes from its editor, a verbal battler who holds no institution sacred and whose forthright pronouncements in his "Tom E. Rott" column have pricked the egos of scores of politicians, both State and local, over the years. King Harvey, at 67, is a character to be reckoned with in northern Maine and few in Aroostook County are inclined to take his opinion lightly.

Mr. Speaker, Kingdon Harvey is the subject of a delightful story by Richard W. Sprague which appeared in the April-May-June edition of the Bangor and Aroostook Railroad's Maine Line magazine. I am inserting this article at this point in the Record, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

AROOSTOOK'S MAGNIFICENT GADFLY

(By Richard W. Sprague)

The weekly newspaper may be diminished from what it was in American journalism but it's still a powerful force in shaping public opinion and influencing the course of events in thousands of American small towns. There are surely more exciting areas of journalism but none, perhaps, where an editor can better savor the direct relationship between what he does every week and its impact on the community.

The Maine weekly has changed considerably in the past 25 years from sovereign, one-man shops to large operations often owned by larger interests. That's not to say that things have changed for the worse; there's a new professionalism in the modern weekly and a competence that may have been missing in the old days. But the Maine weekly of 1975 seems somehow to lack the color and character of, say, John Gould's Lisbon Falls

Enterprise or the fire of Jerry White's Eastport Sentinel.

There are still a few practitioners of the traditional art of personal weekly journalism. They stand like old pines towering above the sky line, often battered by the elements but sturdy enough to endure the punishment. Aroostook County has its own resident curmudgeon and gadfly in Kingdon Harvey, editor of the Fort Fairfield Review.

Not even his close friends would describe the crusty editor of Fort Fairfield's weekly as a benevolent man. A quality of personal warmth notwithstanding, the 45 years he's spent behind the huge roll-top desk as editor, printer, office manager, linotype operator, pressman and general factotum have endowed him with the friendly disposition of a grizzly bear.

He is firmly dedicated to the belief that anything that can happen, will happen and that if you expect it, you won't be surprised or unhappy. It's a philosophy that's made him a crackerjack newspaperman. It has made him a host of enemies among bureaucrats, politicians, corporate types and not a few of his colleagues. But it has also gotten him a few close friends and earned the respect of a lot of people far removed from the Review's circulation area.

In fact the Review, with a circulation of only 2300, occupies a position in Maine journalism far out of proportion to its size. The prestige is the direct result of the editor's blunt honesty, his propensity to hurt darts at the powerful, the corrupt and the officious and a total indifference to any opinion anyone might hold of him.

In appearance, Kingdon Harvey fits his image. His towering forehead and fierce eyes give the impression that he has been well-named. He holds court—after the Review is out on Wednesdays—in an incredibly cluttered office dominated by the roll-top desk used by his father Chandler Cushman Harvey when he was editor, a battered feather couch and dozens of photographs. Without the deadline, Kingdon Harvey comes across as a witty and urbane man of great personal warmth.

His particular delight is politics and politicians and if he can ever be said to become expansive, it's when he speaks of it. If there's anything that pleases him more than to catch a government agency with its soiled laundry exposed, it's a good political battle.

For his prominent targets, there's often been a temptation to dismiss his pen because of the relative insignificance of the Review or to give battle. Either course is a mistake, the former because the Review is Kingdon Harvey and has clout out of proportion to its size, and the latter because doing battle with the Terror of Fort Fairfield is a lot like hand-to-hand combat with a porcupine.

"I guess the most fun I ever had," he muses, wreathed in the smoke of the rank cigars he favors, "was in the primary fight the year Fred Payne ran against Owen Brewster for the Senate. The Bangor Commercial, the Eastport Sentinel and the Review helped tip the scales a little in that election. I guess I've known every governor personally since Brewster in 1925. Burt Cross threatened to sue me for libel once."

The principal vehicle for his arrows is the Tom E. Rott column he writes which is the feature most Review readers turn to first. It's a composite of his sharp wit, folksy news and frequent backhanders at his adversaries. That list currently includes certain of Fort Fairfield's town council who have excluded him from parts of their sessions, the U.S. Weather Service (the "Whether" Bureau in the Harvey vernacular), the Postal Service and occasionally the telephone company and the railroad.

In the halcyon days of railroad monopoly and Populism, the railroad once sued Harvey's father for libel—an action, happily, they lost.

He has tilted with such diverse adversaries as former Senator Margaret Chase Smith and the Bangor Daily News in his column. He once wrote that "it has been reported that Senator Brewster owns a substantial share of stock in the News", a paragraph that brought an indignant denial from the publisher threatening a libel suit if the paper lost circulation as a result of the report. Delighted, Harvey promptly shot off a letter to the publisher explaining that he understood why the paper might lose circulation from such a report, "but," he wrote, "don't you think you ought to cut me in for a share of any increase that results from your denial?"

He can also get a chuckle out of the times an adversary has drawn blood in an exchange. After an editorial exchange with Gov. Burton Cross, Harvey met the Governor at a social function. Never a man to be uncivilized, he went out of his way to shake hands with the official.

To make conversation he added with a grin, "I was by your place the other day but I couldn't stop."

The Governor faced him with a cold eye and replied: "Thanks."

Harvey doesn't exactly treasure the memory but he can laugh about it.

He'll go to the wall for a cause he believes in, no matter what it costs him or anyone else. He was loudly critical of the handling of the Cyrus Everett and Donna Mauch murders in Fort Fairfield in 1967. For two years after the killings (still listed as unsolved) he carried the names and death date of the victims each week.

His detractors have suggested that his pen is more vitriolic than just and have labeled his paper the Fort Fairfield Revenge. And it's probably accurate to say that no one could describe his crusading as restrained. But even his enemies accord him a grudging respect for his blunt, lay-it-on-the-line honesty and his willingness to give anyone a chance to reply in the columns of the Review.

Harvey got into the newspaper business after journalism at the University of Maine when he went to work for his father.

"1930 was a big year for me," he chuckles. "I graduated from the University, married Erm and went to work for Dad."

It was a different world that Kingdon Harvey entered from what would confront today's weekly editor. There was little radio, no television, in short, no competition for either the advertising dollar or the news story.

"You could sit on a story for six days if you had to," he says. "We had as many as ten people working here and put out a 12-page paper every week."

When his father died in 1940, Harvey became editor and worked for his mother until her death in 1967. Only once, he remembers, did his mother ever question a decision. During the time that he had turned his editorial needle on Senator Smith, she canceled her subscription "for economy reasons". Mrs. Harvey, an admirer of the Senator, asked that she continue to receive the paper, a request that Harvey continued until his mother's death.

During lean years and in the times when printers, the most nomadic of artisans, would leave at awkward times, Harvey spent as much time on the linotype machine and the press as he did writing for his paper. Once, he recalls, he spent 33 consecutive hours in the shop without leaving. But when Urban Renewal came to downtown Fort Fairfield and claimed his plant in 1971, he decided to sell the machinery on which he'd spent so much of his life and contract the printing to a modern offset plant in Presque Isle.

"The only machinery I have now is a typewriter," he laughs. "Sometimes I look at my hands and I say to myself, 'Harvey, you can't be working with hands as clean as that. But after working with letterpress for 41 years, offset was sheer magic to me.'"

When his wife, a gentle woman of intelligence and wit, died in 1974, some of the Harvey fire went out. For a lifetime Erm Harvey's grace and beauty had taken much of the sting from her husband's blunt ways.

A lesser man ("... marrying Erm was the best thing that ever happened to me...") might not have straightened his back after such a blow. But Harvey with bulldog determination, began to pick up the pieces of his life doing the only thing he loved... newspapering.

At 67, weathered slightly and battle-scarred but still spare and straight, Kingdon Harvey looks back without regrets on a career in weekly journalism that spans 45 years. He had been a columnist for a daily newspaper as well as a radio commentator. He cannot remember the last time he had a vacation. It's a good thing, as he points out, it's so much fun because it's such damned hard work.

Is this crusty and proud man a latterday Don Quixote tilting at windmills? Is it all sound and fury and drudgery—as some regard weekly journalism—without much meaning? Or is this really where what's important and enduring in our country is happening?

A man who lives far from Aroostook County and who has never met Kingdon Harvey answered the question this way: "I don't know the fella. I read his paper. I don't always agree with him but he's got guts. I wish there were a whole lot more like him."

The fact is Kingdon Harvey is an individualist in an age that gives lip service to the notion but hates it in practice; even the rebels wear uniforms of depressing similarity and speak the same lines.

He is a splendid anachronism in an era of structured knowledge and stylized behaviour. If he were younger, his survival odds would be a little lower than those of a saber-toothed tiger. But society senses a fading in the fierce, green eyes and is willing to indulge the aging warrior.

We should cherish the Kingdon Harveys of the world. They add character and zest to our lives.

And there are never enough of them.

#### CALIFORNIA NATIONAL GUARD: ALWAYS AT WORK

**HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT**  
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is said, "They also serve who only stand and wait." That is the principle we apply in maintaining our large Guard and Reserve forces—ready when we need them, and serving by standing and waiting for that time. In California, however, the National Guard is not content just to stand around.

Our Guard has geared itself to assist our communities at a moment's notice. Its community service program is organized all the way from a central office to control its statewide effort down to each unit's community service coordinator. Last year the California Guard participated in almost 8,000 individual community projects, donating almost 120,000 man-hours to various projects. Many were of the type one would expect of a military organization—providing color guards for parades, patriotic exhibits for county and State fairs, and personnel support for such things as Memorial Day celebrations. Others, however, were projects less obviously in the province of the Guard, even though they were per-

haps a greater service. Projects of this type included:

Placing and collection of Easter Seal canisters. In Sacramento alone, the Guard contributed 96 man-hours to the benefit of 1,500 Californians;

Assorted projects to support the Boy Scouts, to which the Guard contributed over 1,700 man-hours to benefit almost 1,500 Sacramento-area Scouts; and

Grading and resurfacing a playground at an elementary school in my own hometown of Vallejo. This project, to which the Guard contributed not only some 250 man-hours, but also its engineering expertise, will benefit some 600 children annually;

Transportation of underprivileged children in the Sacramento area to Marine World and Santa Cruz beaches. This undertaking involved a contribution of only 16 man-hours, but benefited 39 deprived young Americans;

Provision of personnel and equipment to improve a nature area of Woodridge Elementary School in Sacramento. The Guard in this instance contributed 169 man-hours in order to bring an annual benefit to 600 first-through-sixth graders;

Support for a March of Dimes walkathon in Sacramento County. This project created much citizen interaction and participation as the effort sought to ease the suffering of 3,500 handicapped beneficiaries. The Guard contributed 800 man-hours;

Storing, repairing, collecting, and distribution of toys as part of a toys for tots program in Santa Rosa. The Guard, in a major effort, contributed 4,000 man-hours which benefited 100 California children during the Christmas season;

Supplying personnel for an ecology drive in Oakdale. This project, to which the Guard contributed 1,150 man-hours, is estimated to directly benefit the lives of 500 people;

General renovation and improvement of a boys' ranch in Redding. Guard contributions here of 720 man-hours is expected to benefit 100 annual residents of the estate;

Administration of blood pressure tests in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. This exercise had the Guard contributing 240 man-hours for a benefit to 600 California citizens;

Provision of transportation for high school students to a wilderness area for a backpacking survival class. Twenty-two Lone Pine students benefited from a Guard contribution of 480 man-hours.

Projects of this type, which benefited over 1.6 million Californians last year, held to emphasize the caliber of people the Guard attracts. The desire to serve, evidenced by these undertakings, is just one more reason why we in California are proud of our National Guard.

#### CONSERVE OUR NATIONAL ENERGY RESOURCES

**HON. ALPHONZO BELL**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, any plan to conserve our national energy resources



must be a part, though a large part, of our total national energy program. This national program will encompass increased production, new technologies, and conservation as its major components. All of our efforts under each of these three areas of the energy plan must conform to our national policy goals which are the focus of this plan. These national goals were mentioned in the national plan for energy research, development and demonstration, recently supplied by ERDA, and I wish to quote them:

To maintain the security and policy independence of the Nation.

To maintain a strong and healthy economy, providing adequate employment opportunities and allowing fulfillment of economic aspirations (especially in the less affluent parts of the population).

To provide for future needs so that life styles remain a matter of choice and are not limited by the unavailability of energy.

To contribute to world stability through cooperative international efforts in the energy sphere.

To protect and improve the Nation's environmental quality by assuring that the preservation of land, water, and air resources is given high priority.

These are goals which we must aim toward with every project we institute, whether it be for conservation, increased production, or new technologies.

The options which we have open to us, as a Nation, to solve the energy resources shortage are in fact very limited. Our present energy consumption is inverted with respect to our supplies. The United States currently uses the largest amount of energy from its least abundant national supplies, and uses the least amount of energy from its most abundant supplies. Over 75 percent of our national consumption comes from petroleum and natural gas supplies, while coal, our most abundant supply, provides only 20 percent of our national energy needs. Uranium and solar energy, two of the energy sources with the most potential, have hardly been developed.

The latest energy resources statistics which have been released by the U.S. Geological Survey show that we are rapidly running out of our present petroleum and natural gas supplies. History has taught us that it has taken some 60 years from the point at which a transition to a new energy resource was first discernible until that resource reached its peak use and began to decline. However, these latest estimates show that production will drop rapidly in the mid-1980's. It is unlikely that any new major energy resource could be ready by that time.

We urgently need to both increase our domestic production and at the same time start an intelligent conservation program. Enhanced recovery, which requires some technological development, will buy us roughly 10 years. Adding new sources of supply such as the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserves—which are already in existence—plus new discoveries, will help us satisfy our national needs for a little while longer.

However, even those near-term solu-

tions will require some time before they can have a significant impact. Many of the new techniques for enhanced recovery still must be developed to commercial status. Furthermore, there is a long lead time from discovery of new petroleum reserves, both onshore and offshore, until the oil begins to flow. So we are left with the problem of what programs can be implemented immediately to have a positive affect on our rapidly depleting reserves.

The answer, of course, is conservation on the individual, local, State, and national levels.

Conservation could have a tremendous affect on a day-to-day basis. By resetting thermometers by 3 degrees, we could save 450,000 barrels per day in the winter and 100,000 barrels per day in the summer. A 10 percent increase in the efficiency of heating and lighting in buildings could save almost 300,000 barrels per day. A better program of automobile tuneups could save 350,000 barrels per day. Cold water washing could save another 300,000 barrels per day. An increase by one—from 1.3 to 2.3—in the number of commuters could save our 600,000 barrels per day. All of these programs and others are valuable and could be implemented. Some should be implemented while others should not. However, any such implementation, should be done in the context of an overall plan.

Finally, there are two recent developments which make conservation even more desirable. First of all the sudden increase in energy prices makes it imperative that we as a nation, readjust our energy consumption patterns, through increased efficiency of use. Market forces will tend to do most of this, but a national program of energy conservation will spread the difficulties over the entire population. This way all will carry the burden so that no one will have to shoulder a disproportionate burden. Second, there are national needs which eclipse the private market decisions. Our Nation needs to: First, cut the outflow of dollars to purchase oil and gas, and second, to cut our growing dependence on foreign oil and the accompanying susceptibility to foreign interruptions.

In conclusion, we need to develop an overall program of energy conservation as part of our national plan to deal with the energy resource shortages. This is necessary now while supplies are shrinking and before some of the discoveries and new technologies are available. Whenever this Nation has been called upon to meet a problem as a nation, we have never shrunk from the task.

#### HARMFUL AND INCONSISTENT AGENCY REGULATIONS

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, overregulation by Government agencies

continues to be one of the most serious problems this country faces. Some Members of Congress seem content to add layer upon layer of bureaucracy to the Government while giving these bureaucrats excessive regulatory powers. Unfortunately, it is the citizens beyond Washington who pay the price for this overregulation. A classic example of this problem was recently pointed out in a column in the Washington Star. I would like to insert it in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Star, June 23, 1975]

#### HARASSMENT OF HOSPITALS COULD

##### PROVE EXPENSIVE

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

DAYTON, OHIO.—The federal government's involvement in health care grows larger all the time, and perhaps inevitably, the federal bureaucracy grows along with it. If you happen to be in the hospital business, your life has become an endless hassle.

The Kettering Medical Center, a teaching institute with 409 beds and a staff of 1,400, stands handsomely in a parklike setting just south of Dayton. Completed 11 years ago, it is as modern an institution as one could ask. By any rational standard, it is completely safe. But the Kettering is in deep trouble with the bureaucrats. More than a hundred other hospitals, in 35 states and the District of Columbia, are in the same fix.

In the bureaucratic view, the situation is pure heaven. For the harassed hospital administrators, the situation is something else. In some fashion, the administrators must satisfy the capricious, conflicting, nitpicking, and sometimes foolish demands of competing agencies. If patients and taxpayers truly benefited from this rigamarole, the multiplying rules, regulations and inspections might be justified. No such benefits are apparent.

The Kettering's problems are entirely typical. At the time it was built, the medical center complied fully with the Ohio building code, the municipal fire code, the Hill-Burton construction requirements, and the demands of the underwriters. The hospital was inspected and accredited by the respected Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals (JCAH).

Three years ago, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare got congressional approval for its notion that JCAH accreditations should be "validated." That is, the government's own inspectors, applying their own criteria, should check around. At random, the government selected 144 hospitals for validation. One of them was the Kettering Medical Center.

Last September the validators descended. Dr. M. H. Schaffner, Kettering's president, still is shaken by the experience. The surveyors praised the institution's construction and maintenance, but the team from HEW had its paperwork job to do. By applying its own standards, HEW compiled a bristling "statement of deficiencies." The hospital was ordered promptly to submit a plan of correction.

One complaint had to do with the hospital's airflow system. It was immaterial to the HEW surveyors that the system was safe, efficient and fully in compliance with state and local requirements. Kettering's windows are kept locked—a key is at every nursing station—for sound reasons of patient security and airflow engineering. Never mind, said the bureaucrats. The fenestration must be redesigned and replaced so that windows may be opened. If a sick or deranged patient falls or jumps to his death, too bad.

A hassle developed over wastebaskets. The validators said plastic liners were prohibited,

lest a spark ignite a bag and create toxic smoke. Dr. Schaffner said plaintively that if he took the bags out of the wastebaskets, he could be cited by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Under OSHA regulations, the liners are required, lest hospital workers be infected by handling contaminated trash. An informal compromise was reached. Dr. Schaffner would take the liners out while the HEW inspectors were on the scene, and put them back for the OSHA people.

In an effort to get along, the Kettering has corrected many of the supposed deficiencies. It would cost an estimated \$500,000 to remedy every complaint. The cost ultimately would fall on the patients, who would be not one whit better off. If the hospital fails to comply, HEW could cut off its reimbursement for Medicare and Medicaid patients.

Of the 144 hospitals subjected to validation inspections, 105 lost their accredited status. In 16 states, every hospital failed to qualify. It is only a matter of time, one may be certain, before HEW proposes to extend its own regulations not merely to a random sample of American hospitals, but to all hospitals throughout the nation.

What a dream! Thousands of inspectors! Tens of thousands of clerical assistants! Millions of reports, surveys, studies, summaries, notices, letters, documents! And when "validation" is added to "utilization review" and to a mind-boggling survey of the hour-by-hour activities of hospital physicians the bureaucratic vision becomes apocalyptic. In the end, every taxpayer, and every patient, must pay the bill.

## OPPOSITION TO H.R. 5900, THE "COMMON SITUUS" BILL

HON. IKE F. ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the House will soon determine the fate of H.R. 5900, the "situation picketing" or "secondary boycott" bill. I am opposed to this bill, and a recent survey conducted by Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N.J. shows that more than two-thirds of the public is opposed to it. I wish to insert the results of this survey in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues.

Although this is a "union sponsored" bill, the survey indicates that even a majority of union members—57 percent—are opposed to it.

I do not consider myself antiunion—nor am I seeking to establish such a position—but I truly believe this proposal to be an unreasonable and unnecessary threat to the settlement of labor-management disputes and needed productivity. I hope my colleagues will join me in opposing this bill.

The Business Roundtable has recently received from Opinion Research Corporation of Princeton, New Jersey, results of the

tenth in a series of nationwide surveys it has commissioned of public and union member thinking on matters related to labor law reform and the collective bargaining process. That study will shortly be disseminated publicly, as have previous ones in the series.

Contained in the 1975 survey is a question on the specific subject of union picketing at construction sites. The following is a direction quotation from the Opinion Research Corporation report:

Since 1974 there has been a drop in public sentiment for restricting picketing to the work of the contractor with whom the union is disputing, although favor still is at the two-thirds level.

Today 68% favor restricting such picketing, compared to 73% in 1974; 21% today would allow picketing of an entire building site, up six percentage points in the past year.

Among union members there have been very little change over time. Today 57% would limit picketing to the contractor with whom the union has a dispute while 36% want unions to be able to picket the whole building site.

"On building sites many unions represent different kinds of employees of contractors working there—electricians, carpenters, plumbers, and so forth.

"When one of the unions is striking against one of the contractors, which of these two rules do you think should apply?"

"A. The union should only be allowed to picket the work of the contractor with whom it has a dispute and not the whole building site or—

"B. The union should be allowed to picket the whole building site, even if it stops work of all other contractors and employees."

[In percent]

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1974	Latest survey
General public:									
Favor A.....	68	68	71	71	69	70	72	73	68
Favor B.....	15	18	15	17	17	14	15	15	21
No opinion.....	17	14	14	12	14	16	13	12	11
Union members:									
Favor A.....	55	55	60	60	57	58	58	61	57
Favor B.....	37	39	33	35	35	35	36	34	36
No opinion.....	8	6	7	5	8	7	6	5	7

Sentiment favoring limited picketing is high among: 30-39 year olds (72%), members of professional or clerical families (77%), residents of small urban communities (74%), residents of Western states (72%), people in upper-income families (75%), and thought leaders (72%).

These results are based on a nationwide probability sample of 1,023 persons 18 years of age and over, taken during the period January 10 through February 3, 1975. Respondents were interviewed personally in their homes by trained ORC interviewers, and the interviewing vehicle employed was the ORC Caravan service.

Opinion Research Corporation's master sample is based on a new probability sample design prepared in consultation with the late J. Stevens Stock of Marketmath, Inc., and modified and updated periodically by ORC.

In its technical appendix to the complete survey, Opinion Research Corporation describes its probability master sample as follows:

"The essential characteristic of probability sampling is that, for each person in the population under study, the probability that he will be included in the sample can be specified. This means that the degree of reliability of any finding from a study based on probability sample can be estimated mathematically.

"The ORC sample design is a major improvement over standard areal probability designs now in common use. These areal methods depend upon the use of maps showing geographic segments from which rough

population estimates can be made. These maps are often out-of-date and otherwise inaccurate, and population estimates are frequently unreliable for small geographic areas, particularly as time passes from one census to another.

"The new sampling method eliminates these important problems of traditional probability sampling by using current address directories as the basis for a system of defining interviewing starting points—a system which, of course, also includes sample households not in the directory. The new method is both statistically and administratively efficient as possible, providing the most reliable data for any given expenditure."

Samples used in prior years on which the above question on construction site picketing was asked generally involved about 2,000 interviews. Comparing the results for the total public obtained in this survey of approximately 1,000, differences of 3% to 5% are needed before they can be regarded as statistically significant.

The drop from the 73% of the total public favoring "Plan A" in 1974 to the 68% favoring it in 1975 can be regarded as statistically significant on a 95-out-of-100 chance basis. Likewise, the increase in the total public vote of 15% to 21% in favor of "Plan B" is significant on the same basis.

By contrast, the differences in union member thinking from 1974 to 1975, representing sub-samples of the total public and hence smaller numbers of people, are within the bounds of statistical chance and cannot be regarded as significant.

ALEXANDR SOLZHENITSYN

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the White House has announced that President Ford is indeed willing to receive Alexandr Solzhenitsyn. This may lessen the personal slight entailed in the President's previous refusal to meet the great Russian writer and freedom-fighter. But the really important questions raised by the President's initial desire to avoid Solzhenitsyn are not answered by his recent change of mind. Those questions concern the nature of détente as pursued by this administration.

Détente, we are told by the administration, is a policy of reducing tensions, promoting international stability, and preventing nuclear war. It is a policy designed to assure peace.

Détente, we are told by the administration, is certainly not appeasement. The American people know, the world has learned, that appeasement assures not peace, but war.

But détente, we have been told by its architects, is different from appeasement



because détente implies no compromise of our principles and no diminution of our commitment to freedom. Rather, détente will allow for peaceful competition and freer flow of ideas. Similarly, we are told that détente entails no illusions about the Soviets nor subservience to them, but rather consists of tough-minded agreements forged out of mutual self-interest.

Solzhenitsyn is perhaps the most important critic of détente. He, more forcefully than any other, has questioned whether this distinction between détente and appeasement is real or illusory. President Ford has lent more weight to Solzhenitsyn's criticisms by snubbing him than he would have by embracing him.

Why, if détente implies no compromise of our principles, does the President refuse to greet one of the world's outstanding freedom-fighters for fear of offending some of the world's most outstanding oppressors of human freedom?

Why, if one goal of détente is to promote a freer flow of ideas, does our President shy away from a man exiled from his country for the "crime" of espousing the most fundamental idea of western thought—individual liberty?

Why, if détente is forged out of the hard rock of mutual self-interest, should we show the slightest concern about offending Soviet leaders by bestowing due honor on a man whom they have persecuted?

Why, if détente entails no illusions about the Soviet system, should the President shy from a man who has so much to tell us about that system?

Solzhenitsyn himself has not proposed the abandonment of the pursuit of détente. Instead he has called for the pursuit of what he calls a "true détente." He is very much to the point. The real question before America is not détente or war, rather it is: What kind of détente? A détente based on American firmness both in negotiating and in defense of our principles will serve the cause of peace far better than a détente entered into in weakness and fear.

It is encouraging that the President has changed his mind about inviting Solzhenitsyn to the White House even if that reversal does not calm all of the doubts raised by his initial decision. It is particularly encouraging that the President was at least in part led to this reversal by the outcry of enraged public opinion. This indicates that the public in large numbers has a sense of the kind of détente it wants. And it gives hope that if the President will lead us in pursuit of a "true détente," guided perhaps in part by some of the things which we can all learn from Solzhenitsyn, he will be able to rally the kind of popular support on which any effective foreign policy must be based.

#### CONGRESSIONAL VACATIONS

#### HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, with the August recess coming up, I suspect that

we are going to be hearing from some of our constituents a few choice words on the subject of congressional "vacations." What we have, I regret to say, is a failure to communicate with the people on the relationship between "work" and "recess." I guess that most people, remembering their schooldays, think of a "recess" as a playtime. As you know Mr. Speaker, for most of us it is no playtime, as an inventory of my own recess schedule shows.

Since coming to the Congress in January, I have spent a total of 35 days in Colorado's Second District; and each day has been as full as humanly possible. For example, on one typical February day, I had nine meetings, with people ranging from IBM executives discussing medical insurance, to the Sierra Club discussing wilderness, to representatives of a project on housing for the handicapped.

In my full working days in the district—excluding Sundays—I have attended 161 formal meetings and civic events. In addition, there have been many more individual meetings with constituents, press conferences and interviews, and other informal sessions.

Looking over the combined schedules for all my district trips, I find that it provides an accurate reflection of the interests of the people of the Second District. Energy, for instance, is an important issue in Colorado, and I have had 11 meetings on energy affairs. Another focus of concern is, as you might expect in a Colorado constituency, the environment; I have had five different meetings on that subject.

In addition, there were 22 consultations with business, 12 labor, 5 senior citizen groups, 6 religious groups, 12 schools, 12 hospitals and health care professionals, and 11 local government officials. I now have a mobile office van, and I made six lengthy trips in it. And no time in the district is complete without some unusual event, such as the Colorado University "Trivia Bowl."

I am particularly proud of the special events that my office has arranged. A recent example was a roundtable discussion of energy policy which I convened in Denver, at which a panel of experts helped me explain the issues and problems to the people of Colorado. Over 300 concerned citizens attended that event. An upcoming example is a similar discussion on waste-water recycling, which I will be holding in Lakewood, Colo., during the August recess.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, we reorganized the schedule of the House when the 94th Congress reconvened in January. Instead of operating under the traditional "Tuesday to Thursday Club," with Members going home every week for a long weekend, we set a firm schedule for the whole year, including full workweeks and scheduled time in the district. The purpose of this schedule was threefold:

First. The House could have more days in session, by working full weeks instead of just Tuesday to Thursday.

Second. District time could be carefully planned and scheduled around traditional holiday periods, rather than last minute district visits as in the past.

Third. Fairness to those from distant areas would be emphasized—representatives from California, or Colorado for that matter, would have time to get home and get some work done before they have to turn right around and come back to Washington.

The overall purpose of the new schedule, Mr. Speaker, is to recognize that each of us in the Congress has many responsibilities—those here in Washington on legislation and the affairs of the Congress; and those in our districts, working with our constituents, developing locally based projects and legislation, and hearing firsthand people's ideas, thoughts and opinions.

I firmly believe that our new schedule makes a great deal of sense. It makes the Congress a more efficient institution, and it provides the Members with the opportunity to better work with their constituents. As my earlier remarks indicate, I think I have been able to make good use of this schedule.

#### IMPROVING HEALTH CARE FOR URBAN INDIANS

#### HON. JOEL PRITCHARD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned over the small amount of appropriations allotted to the Indian Health Services budget. Programs funded under this line item have been very successful in the counseling, treatment, and continuing health care of Indians.

The Seattle Indian Health Board Clinic is the largest urban Indian health care program in the country, serving 12,000 patients annually. The clinic not only provides medical facilities and medical care for urban-situated Indians but is a bridge between other urban medical services. The Seattle Indian Health Board seeks out Indians located in the urban environment who normally would be overlooked or spurned away from regular medical routes by insensitivity to Indian needs, and helps them with their medical concerns.

With a goal that is simply stated "to upgrade the level of health of the Indians," the Seattle Indian Health Board has identified and tried to solve problems that urban Indians have had with urban health services, whether it be financial, bureaucratic, or lack of interest. They attempt to alleviate the barriers that have, probably for no obvious reason, been put up in front of Indians in their attempts to receive adequate medical care.

Not only do they directly work with urban Indians in providing medical care, but the health board also is in the process of training 18 practitioners to work with Indians after their schooling is done. Out of their 90 employees, 71 of them are Indians. Recently two Indian doctors have volunteered their time to help in the delivery of medical services.

The future of the clinic is jeopardized at a time when Congress is on the verge

of enacting the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (H.R. 2525), which passed the Senate last year. Programs such as the Seattle Indian Health Board Clinic would be funded directly under title V of the act. In the interim, it is imperative that the most successful of all urban Indian health programs not be allowed to fade away.

The Seattle Indian Health Board Clinic has had to rely on almost a dozen different funding sources, some of which—such as Section 314(d) funds and regional medical program funds—have been eliminated by Congress or cut back by the administration. The appropriation monies are simply a replacement of those Federal funds by the Indian Health Service.

With the lack of previous Indian involvement in the health services, the Seattle Indian Health Board is providing a ray of light in the confusion that exists for Indians when they attempt to confront the mind-boggling problems that are evident in the delivery of health care.

This is a successful case, and there are others, but we must continue funding this vitally needed item. Recently the Seattle clinic expanded, and they have hopes of offering more complete services to urban Indians. This of course takes money.

As one member of the Seattle Indian Health Board said:

It's working and we just want it to work more.

Such a successful program certainly deserves more congressional support.

#### BIG BANKERS ARE GETTING RESTLESS AGAIN AND WANT EXCUSES TO EXORBITANT INTEREST RATES RETURNED NOW

#### HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the big banks are apparently getting ready to head out for another year of record-high profits while the Nation struggles to recover from the worst recession since the Great Depression and 8.5 million people are without jobs.

First National City Bank of New York, the Nation's second largest, announced on July 11 that it was raising its prime rate from 7 percent to 7½ percent. Three days later, First National Bank of Chicago, Continental Illinois of Chicago, Mellon Bank of Pittsburgh, Crocker National Bank of San Francisco, and Union Bank of Los Angeles quickly jumped on the old, familiar bandwagon by announcing they too were raising their interest rates for their best customers, the big corporate borrowers. All the other large commercial banks across the country will undoubtedly play "follow the leader" again in what will be another round of inflation pumping interest rate increases applied to small as well as big borrowers.

It is axiomatic that when the prime rate climbs, other types of loan rates—automobile, consumer, residential mort-

gage, small and medium size business—either remain at intolerably high levels or move in that direction. It is a phenomena that could be called "The Bankers Rule of Maximizing Profits Regardless of Cost to the Economy."

The cold reasoning by which many leaders of the banking industry rationalize their actions was articulated a few days ago by Richard L. Thomas, vice chairman of the board of the First National Bank of Chicago. In reporting this current round of prime rate increases, the New York Times quoted him as saying:

**BIG BANKERS ARE GETTING RESTLESS AGAIN AND WANT EXCUSES TO EXORBITANT INTEREST RATES RETURNED NOW**

"We are confident that this a forerunner" of further interest rate increases. He told the Times that his bank raised its prime rate because of recent increases in interest rates paid by the bank for short term funds.

But he added that the prime rate was also raised because of "pretty good loan demand." In other words, First National of Chicago is not going to betray its principles by failing to capitalize on the struggle to increase investments and develop some strength in what has been and still is a sick economy.

Mr. Thomas frosted the bankers cake, as it were, by going on to say that if the economy strengthens over the rest of the year, "we think the trend [in interest rates] will be upward."

Mr. Speaker, the bankers are obviously growing restless again. It's been more than a year since the prime rate was at an historic high of 12 percent and they have been away from that level too long.

On the same day that the Times was reporting this new round of prime rate increases, the Wall Street Journal disclosed that "more large banking concerns reported sizeable earnings gains for the second quarter."

These included BankAmerica Corporation, parent bank holding company of Bank of America of San Francisco, the nation's largest bank, which had second quarter income increase of 25.7 percent over the corresponding period of 1974; Chase Manhattan Corporation, holding company for Chase Manhattan Bank of New York, with an increase of 38.7 percent; Manufacturers Hanover Corporation, parent bank holding company of Manufacturers Hanover Bank, which had an 18.6 percent increase in net operating income; the Charter New York Corporation, bank holding company for Irving Trust, with an 18.7 percent increase; Mellon National Corporation, parent of Mellon Bank, with an 8.4 percent increase; and First Chicago Corporation, parent of First National Bank of Chicago, up 10.6 percent.

The Journal reported that "as with other banks that previously have reported first half results, the latest gains chiefly reflect an improvement in interest net income."

Mr. Speaker, it looks as though the big banks can look forward to even better profits in the third quarter and fourth quarter of the year at the expense of slower economic recovery and high unemployment.

#### THE ASSAULT ON THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY: THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE FOR THE FIFTH ESTATE

#### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, among the most vociferous crit-

ics of the Central Intelligence Agency and other branches of the American intelligence community is the Organizing Committee for the Fifth Estate—OC-5—which describes itself as "dedicated to spying on Big Brother, the American intelligence community."

The OC-5's current campaign demands the total abolition of the CIA; its corollary aim is to provide support for defectors from that and other Federal and local agencies.

OC-5's current staffers include Timothy Charles Butz, a former Washington organizer for the Vietnam Veterans Against the War/Winter Soldier Organization; Perry Fellwock, who uses the alias Winslow Peck; Douglas Ethan Allen Oliver Porter, Jr.; and Margaret Van Houten. It is noted that background reports on the Organizing Committee for the Fifth Estate were provided for the benefit of my colleagues on February 20, 1975, and March 19, 1975, in my Extensions of Remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Organizing Committee for the Fifth Estate publication Counter-Spy serves as a clearing house for the many groups involved in attacking aspects of Federal and local intelligence agencies and programs.

In light of the question, who benefits from the exposure and destruction of American intelligence operations, it is both relevant and appropriate to examine the backgrounds and affiliations of the OC-5 advisory board.

As listed by the most recent issue of OC-5's quarterly journal, Counter-Spy, they include:

#### LISTINGS IN THE COUNTER-SPY

Philip Agee, former CIA case officer.  
Fred Branfman, Co-Director, Indochina Resource Center.  
Sylvia Crane, National Committee Against Repressive Legislation.  
David Dellinger, Institute for New Communications.  
Frank Donner, ACLU Political Surveillance Project.  
Robert Katz, Assassination Information Project.  
Mark Lane, Citizen's Commission of Inquiry.  
Dr. Ralph Lewis, Criminal Justice Research Director, Michigan State University.  
Victor Marchetti, former CIA official.  
Col. L. Fletcher Prouty (ret.), former military liaison to the CIA.  
K. [Kenneth] Barton Osborn, former MI agent and consultant to the CIA.  
Marcus Raskin, Co-Director, Institute for Policy Studies.  
Tony Russo, former RAND Corp. employee.  
Kirkpatrick Sale, author.  
Stanley Scheinbaum, American Civil Liberties Union.  
Rev. Phillip Wheaton, Ecumenical Program for Inter-American Communication and Action.

Philip Agee, 40, after 13 years as a Central Intelligence Agency employee principally in Latin America, announced his conversion to "revolutionary socialism." Agee is notorious for his detailed exposé of his former employer entitled "Inside the Company: CIA Diary."

Agee has admitted to the mass media that he made some half dozen trips to Cuba during the writing of his exposé, and that he frequently was in touch with officers from Cuban embassies in Europe. Agee has stated, "Quite frankly, I don't



care whether they're intelligence officers or not," and has expressed the hope that his disclosures "will provide the first steps toward the abolition of the CIA."

In his acknowledgements section in "Inside the Company," Agee stated his book could not have been written without the encouragement of representatives of the Communist Party of Cuba, the resources of the Cuban Government, and information provided by staffers of the North American Congress on Latin America, an anti-U.S. research group with close ties to the Cuban Government.

Frederick Robert Branfman, 33, was active with the International Voluntary Service in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Upon his return to the United States in 1971, Branfman immediately took a leadership role in the ranks of the so-called "antiwar" propagandists supporting the North Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotian Communist insurgents. On May 4 in Washington, D.C., Branfman joined with Arthur Kinoy, David Dellinger, and other leaders of the revolutionary National Interim Committee for a Mass Party of the People for a Lafayette Park "celebration" to honor the bloodstained Communist victory in Vietnam.

Sylvia E. Crane was one of the founders and is currently a national officer of the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, formerly the National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee/House Internal Security Committee. Under its original name, this organization was cited, after extensive investigation, as a Communist front. The organization is still headed by identified Communist Frank Wilkinson.

David Dellinger, who described himself in an SDS radical education project brochure in 1969 as a "Communist, although not of the Soviet variety," has however clearly demonstrated his support of the Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Cuban varieties of Marxism-Leninism. His Institute for New Communications is the publisher of a new radical newsweekly, *Seven Days*, currently in the "preview" edition stages.

Frank J. Donner, in addition to his present position as head of the ACLU's political surveillance project at Yale Law School, has the dubious distinction of having been thrice identified as a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. He was identified twice as a member of a Communist Party cell in the National Labor Relations Board in Washington, D.C., which employed him in its litigation section from 1940 until 1945.

Called before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1956 and confronted with a Civil Service Commission questionnaire on which he had answered "no" to membership in a Communist organization, Donner invoked the fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination when asked if his statement had been truthful.

In 1959, Donner was a member of the law firm of Donner, Sacher, Perlin & Freedman, as was Arthur Kinoy. Harry Sacher has also been identified as a member of the Communist Party. During the

1960's, Donner was general counsel for the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, a Communist controlled union expelled from the CIO in 1950. He has been associated with such identified CPUSA fronts during the 1950's and 1960's as the National Lawyer's Guild, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, and the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

Since the late 1950's, Frank Donner has devoted much of his energy to counter-security activities. His 1961 book, "The Un-Americans," served to create major publicity for the initial stages of the Communist Party's Operation Abolition attack on the House Committee on Un-American Activities—HCUA—and later the House Internal Security Committee.

The HCUA report, "Communist Legal Subversion: The Role of the Communist Lawyer," in 1959 noted that "Speaking on such topics as 'Informers as a Means of Suppression,' and 'Informers as Tools,' Donner has excoriated all individuals who have been of assistance to congressional committees."

During more recent years, since heading up the ACLU's antisurveillance operation, Donner has used such left-leaning forums as the Nation, a magazine characterized by HCUA as "Communist-line" in 1961 and whose editor the California Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities noted, has participated "in the activities of the Communist Party itself"; ACLU's the Civil Liberties Review; and the New York Review of Books; to argue for the dismantling of the American intelligence community.

It was Frank Donner who was sought for comments—of a scatological nature—on my CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports on current U.S. revolutionary activity by the rock music and counter-culture magazine, *Rolling Stone*. To avoid an impression of partisanship, *Rolling Stone* might obtain comments from other than Communists and National Lawyers Guild members, no matter what other positions they may hold.

Robert Katz' Assassination Information Bureau is one of the many groups investigating allegations of conspiratorial theories behind several murders of political figures, including that of President Kennedy.

Mark Lane, an attorney and activist since the early 1950's with the National Lawyers Guild, has been involved in defense work with the American Indian movement in the Wounded Knee cases. In view of his more serious activities with the National Lawyers Guild, "legal bulwark of the Communist Party," and with the Wounded Knee Legal Defense/Offense Committee, Mr. Lane should not be needed for his "investigation" of the assassination of President Kennedy, an investigation which resulted in a lucrative and best-selling book.

Dr. Ralph Lewis, a sociologist holding a doctor of education degree, has a key role in the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA—funded programs at Michigan State University

where he is criminal justice research director. A former assistant director of the Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence, Dr. Lewis has worked with police departments in Portland, Oreg.; Miami and Boston as an expert in the area of civil disorder.

Currently teaching a course entitled "Project Planning and Evaluation"—MSU program 833—Dr. Lewis' association with the organizing committee for the Fifth Estate, while in no way covert, has a damaging potential for police departments who look to LEAA for funding assistance.

Victor Marchetti, coauthor with John Marks, a former State Department intelligence analyst, of "The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence," has been active in a number of anti-intelligence seminars and meetings. On April 5, 1975, Marchetti and Marks were slated to appear at a Yale Law School "inquiry" into the CIA featuring Mrs. Hortensia Bussi de Allende. Others involved with the seminar were CPUSA members Frank Donner and Ernest De Maio; Fred Branfman; Kirkpatrick Sale; Daniel Ellsberg; and Leonard Boudin, general counsel of the CPUSA front, the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

L. Fletcher Prouty, 57, was recently reported by columnist Mary McGrory to be a public relations executive with Amtrack. Retired from the Air Force in 1963, Prouty has another hat to wear in addition to his OC-5 advisory board role—that of Washington, D.C., editor of *Genesis*, the "magazine for men." Spread over many pages of that pornographic publication was Prouty's April issue article, "Curbing the CIA," no doubt to lend some semblance of social significance to the magazine.

Kenneth Barton "Bart" Osborn was one of the founding members of the organizing committee for the Fifth Estate.

Marcus Raskin's Institute for Policy Studies was accurately characterized by Paul Dickson in "Think Tanks" as attempting to lay the groundwork for the new society that will replace the present one. It not only has dedicated itself to ushering in the new society by inquiry and experimentation but is also doing what it can to hasten the demise of the present one. Raskin, long a disarmament advocate, was the founder of the New Party in 1968, now called the People's Party, a self-stated Socialist organization. For the past 15 years, Raskin has consistently supported the total dismantling of the Armed Forces; disarmament of not only the Armed Forces, but of police and civilians; and an end to U.S. opposition to foreign guerrilla insurgencies.

Anthony J. "Tony" Russo, Jr., a former defendant in the Pentagon Papers case, testified on behalf of Karleton Armstrong, an admitted member of the New Left terrorist New Year's Gang which killed a graduate student August 24, 1970, in the bombing of the Army Mathematics Research Center on the University of Wisconsin campus at Madison.

The New York Times reported Mr. Russo's "mitigation of sentence" testimony for Karl Armstrong as follows:

In his testimony, Mr. Russo said that after one trip back to the United States from Vietnam in 1968, when he was employed by the Rand Corporation, a "think tank" with government research contracts, I brought a grenade back.

I was angry, very angry, he said over the continuing escalation of the war. "I walked down the halls of Rand to the computer room and wanted to toss it in there. I thought I had to do this for mankind." He said that he finally threw the grenade off a pier at Santa Monica, Calif.

Mr. Russo was also quoted as saying that he didn't have the strength to use the grenade; however, Had I been younger I would have done it.

Kirkpatrick Sale, author of the revealing radical history of the Students for a Democratic Society, entitled SDS, according to the Daily World was involved with the anti-CIA conference on April 5 at Yale Law School which featured Mrs. Hortensia Allende, widow of the deposed Marxist President of Chile and a vice president of the internationally active Soviet front, the Women's International Democratic Federation.

Rev. Philip Wheaton of the National Council of Churches—funded Ecumenical Program for Inter-American Communications and Action—EPICA—is active with the Common Front for Latin America—COFFLA—an organization which shares his 1500 Farragut Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20011 office address. COFFLA sponsored the local appearance of the Quilapayun folk music group, the cultural group of the Young Communist League of Chile. Another COFFLA member, Mary Harding, a former Maryknoll nun, admitted she was a member and recruiter for the Bolivian ELN guerrillas founded by Che Guevara, and is sponsoring the Venceremos Brigade's Committee for the 26th of July events in support of the Cuban Communist regime.

The current edition of Counter-Spy suggests a series of fall campus demonstrations against CIA and National Security Agency recruiters and against various local CIA offices.

In an editorial letter, OC-5 writes:

As spring approached and the thaw developed around the once invincible fortress of national security, we were fighting for our very existence. A series of financial pledges withered away simultaneously with attacks from the far-right, elements of the intelligence community and other government agencies. Slandering and distorted information was placed in the Congressional Record by Georgia Congressman Larry McDonald, a member in good standing of the John Birch Society, and a leader of that outfit. McDonald was challenged by us to make the same allegations in a forum where Congressional immunity from lawsuits did not apply, but like other demagogues in the past, he prefers to hide in the pages of the Congressional Record. During the same week of McDonald's ravings we were red-baited to a few of our friends in the press by some of the 'old boys.' Rumors reached us that the CIA considers us 'Cuban agents,' an unbelievably absurd charge. And then our financial base was all but destroyed during the same period.

CXXI—1489—Part 18

Taking into account OC-5's contacts with foreign intelligence operations, such as Philip Agee's membership on the OC-5 advisory board, the "Cuban agents" charge may be taken as an investigative lead as to the true operation of the Organizing Committee for the Fifth Estate.

#### PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY QUARTERLY DEPOSIT PROCEDURE FOR STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

HON. JOEL PRITCHARD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 18, 1975

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, as you may be aware, the Social Security Administration—SSA—has made clear it intends to require States and local governments to make monthly, instead of quarterly, deposits of social security contributions for their covered employees.

The voluntary agreements between the States and SSA under section 218—of the Social Security Act—were made with the mutual understanding that social security contributions were to be paid quarterly, as they have been without question since public employees were first covered in 1951.

Under the terms of each joint Federal-State agreement, each State is responsible for administering its own social security program and must bear the cost of its administration. The proposed change promises to greatly increase each State's administrative costs while eliminating any opportunity the States have to offset the costs of administration with interest earnings from the funds. In the aggregate, the States will lose about \$120 million in interest annually—at a time when they will be required to incur even greater administrative expenses.

Each State now files form OAR-S1 with SSA each quarter to report social security tax information. In addition, each State must also file a form OAR-S3 somewhat equivalent to form 941-A of IRS—each quarter containing wage information on each employee. When you realize that there are about 62,000 State and local government reporting entities with almost 9 million employees, you can readily appreciate the concern of State and local administrators that money and paperwork have to be handled three times more often.

Because of the proposed change, several States have considered terminating their Federal-State compact—denying social security coverage to their public employees. The States justifiably view the joint agreement as a two-way street—and they have made it clear that they will resist attempts to have added expenses unilaterally thrust upon them by moving for termination. The proposed shift, which was never agreed to by the States, surely violates the spirit of the

section 218 agreements if not the actual language.

Prior to their entrance into the State-Federal agreement, many States had to obtain enabling legislation from their legislatures. Because this legislation contained the guidelines under which the State agency would operate, including in some cases the quarterly deposit procedure, the implementation of SSA's proposed regulation would require action by the State legislature in some States.

In order to add on new employees to handle the monthly deposit procedure, some State administrators will have to go to their legislatures to obtain exceptions to budget ceiling laws or to statutory ceilings on the hiring of new personnel. Compounding this problem is the fact that many State legislatures operate on a biennium—and meet once every 2 years.

If deposits are made monthly and reports filed quarterly—or annually as proposed by the SSA—further problems arise. Many State and local financial procedures—in order to comply with State statute and constitutional provisions—will not allow money to be paid out of the State treasury which is based upon estimates.

Making a switch to a quarterly deposit procedure even more complex is the fact that all but two States have institutionalized the quarterly deposit procedure for their State retirement systems. Under the current system, the coincidence of deposit dates substantially reduces the cost of administration of the State retirement systems. A monthly deposit procedure for social security contributions promises to impose additional costs on the administration of State retirement systems.

The Federal proponents of stepping-up the periodic deposit procedure do not believe that they are imposing any additional burden on State and local governments, because, in the words of the Treasury Secretary:

Most local units of government have highly sophisticated accounting procedures . . . and equipment.

In fact, the majority of local governments—towns, cities, and counties—in most States do not have centralized payroll systems, do not have modern accounting equipment, do not have full-time paid officials, and in many cases do not even have actual office quarters. One State social security administrator informed me that many times he receives quarterly written-out on notebook paper and even on a brown paper sack in a few instances.

The SSA argues that the current " . . . deposit system is no longer justified in that large sums of money are lost to the Social Security Trust Fund . . ." and " . . . this loss must be made up by all . . . taxpayers. Economists have told me that because taxpayers pay both State and local taxes, the net effect is zero. The issue is clearly whether the Federal Government will reap windfall interest income—about \$120 million—at the expense of the States.



## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

July 18, 1975

No further action by SSA will be taken until both they and the Subcommittee on Social Security have had an opportunity to review the results of an SSA questionnaire and a State-by-State analysis of statistics being assembled by the National Conference of State Social Security Administrators.

However, the SSA—at the behest of the Office of Management and Budget, the HEW Secretary and the Treasury Secretary—have made clear that they intend to implement the more frequent deposit procedure despite the adverse fiscal impact on States and their political subdivisions.

I have prepared legislation which would codify the current quarterly deposit procedure for State and local government contributions. This bill (H.R. 7740) would retain the current practice which has worked so well for the last 24 years.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I insert the text of my legislation into the RECORD along with some relevant background information—including a State-by-State list of those officials and administrators who have indicated their support for codifying the current quarterly deposit procedure:

## APPENDIX A—STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS SUPPORTING THE QUARTERLY DEPOSIT PROCEDURE

**ALABAMA**  
Governor George C. Wallace.

**COLORADO**  
Governor Richard D. Lamm.

**CONNECTICUT**  
Governor Ella Grasso, Hartford Court of Common Council, J. Edward Caldwell, Comptroller.

**DELAWARE**  
Governor Sherman W. Tribitt.

**FLORIDA**  
Governor Reubin O. D. Askew.

**GEORGIA**  
Governor George Busbee.

**IDAHO**  
Governor Ceisel Andrus.

**ILLINOIS**  
Governor Dan Walker.

**IOWA**  
Governor Robert Ray.

**KANSAS**  
Governor Robert Bennett, Kansas Legislative Coordinating Council, State Senator Richard D. Rogers.

**MARYLAND**  
Governor Marvin Mandel, Maryland State Social Security Division.

**MISSISSIPPI**  
Governor Bill Waller.

**MONTANA**  
Governor Thomas L. Judge.

**NEW JERSEY**  
Governor Brendan T. Byrne, William J. Joseph, Director, Division of Pensions, Edward G. Hofgesang, Acting Director, Division of Budget & Accounting; Clifford A. Goldman, Deputy State Treasurer.

**NEW MEXICO**  
Governor Jerry Apodaca, Betty Lujan, Director, State Social Security Division.

**NORTH CAROLINA**  
Governor James E. Holshouser, Harlan E. Boyles, Secretary, Local Government Commission, North Carolina Department of Administration, Edwin Gill, State Treasurer.

**NORTH DAKOTA**  
Governor Arthur A. Link.

**OKLAHOMA**  
Governor David L. Boren.

**PENNSYLVANIA**  
Governor Milton J. Shapp.

**RHODE ISLAND**  
Governor Phillip Noel.

**SOUTH DAKOTA**  
Governor Richard F. Kneip, Alice Kundert, State Auditor.

**TENNESSEE**  
Governor Ray Blanton.

**TEXAS**  
Governor Dolph Briscoe.

**UTAH**  
Governor Calvin L. Rampton.

**VERMONT**  
Governor Thomas P. Salmon.

**VIRGINIA**  
Governor Mills E. Godwin.

**WASHINGTON**  
Governor Daniel J. Evans.

**WEST VIRGINIA**  
John M. Gates, State Auditor, West Virginia Social Security Division.

**WISCONSIN**  
Governor Patrick J. Lucey, Charles P. Smith, State Treasurer, Alta Moore, Public

Employees Social Security Bureau.

**WYOMING**  
Governor Ed Hepschler.

## APPENDIX B—ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE QUARTERLY DEPOSIT PROCEDURE

National Governors Conference.  
National Conference of State Social Security Administrators.  
National Association of State Budget Organizations.  
Council of State Governments (Steering Committee on State Government Accounting Principles and Practices).  
Municipal Finance Officers Association.

## APPENDIX C—TEXT OF H.R. 7740

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to assure the continuation of the present practice under which payments by States, with respect to coverage of State and local employees under section 218 of that Act, are made on a quarterly basis.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 218(e) (1) (A) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(A) that the State will pay to the Secretary of the Treasury on or before the fifteenth day of the second month following each calendar quarter, in such manner as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may by regulations prescribe, amounts equivalent to the sum of the taxes which would be imposed by sections 3101 and 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to services performed during such quarter by employees covered by the agreement if such services constituted employment as defined in section 3121 of such Code; and".

## APPENDIX D—STATE AND LOCAL REPORTING DATA

I. Total covered State and political subdivision employees, approximately 9 million.  
II. Total number of political subdivisions providing employee coverage, 61,512.

III. Contribution payments by States—calendar year 1974, \$7,382,838,464.18.

States paying over \$1,000,000,000 yearly, 1.  
States paying \$500,000,000 to one billion, 1.  
States paying \$100,000,000 to 500 million, 22.

States paying 50 million to 100 million, 10.  
States paying 10 million to 50 million, 14.  
States paying 5 to 10 million, 1.  
States paying 1 to 5 million, 1.  
States paying below one million, 2.

Source: Social Security Administration.

## APPENDIX E

## ESTIMATED LOSS IN INTEREST INCOME TO THE STATES BY MORE FREQUENT DEPOSITS

(In millions)

Calendar year	State and local contributions <sup>2</sup> (liability basis and in millions)	Estimated loss in interest income <sup>1</sup> in millions during year							
		Monthly requirements; effective date: Jan. 1—				FICA requirements; effective date: January—			
		1974	1975	1976	1977	1974	1975	1976	1977
1974	\$7,400	\$71				\$118			
1975	8,307	92	\$73			146	\$122		
1976 <sup>3</sup>	9,390	82	77	\$60		131	124	\$101	
1977 <sup>3</sup>	10,604	123	117	110	\$67	197	187	177	\$113
1978	12,348	148	141	134	127	237	226	215	204
1979	13,555	173	166	158	151	277	265	254	241
1980	14,923	199	191	183	175	318	305	293	280

<sup>1</sup> The interest computations reflect the amount of interest actually credited to the trust fund in each year. For 1974 the interest was computed on the basis of the actual rate paid on new issues. For 1975 and later years the interest rate assumed for new investments is 6 1/2 percent. (The 6 1/2 percent is the rate in the 1975 trustees' report and the President's 1976 budget.)

<sup>2</sup> Projects automatic increase in earnings base and the hospital rate increase (1.8 to 2.2) scheduled for 1978.

<sup>3</sup> The figures for these 2 yrs reflect the change in investment maturity rates resulting from the change in the Federal fiscal year.

Source: Social Security Administration.